CANADIAN PERMANENT COMMITTEE ON GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES

COMITÉ PERMANENT CANADIEN DES NOMS GÉOGRAPHIQUES

CANADA

First
Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names

Canada, Permanent
Committee on
Geographical
Names
[General publications]
[G-1]

United Nations
Geneva 1967 Genève
Nations Unies

Première **Conférence**
sur la **Normalisation**
des **Noms Géographiques**

PARTICIPATION
by / du
CANADA

OTTAWA
1968

THE CONFERENCE IN SESSION AT THE PALAIS DES NATIONS,
GENEVA, SEPTEMBER 5, 1967

Members of the Canadian Delegation:

J-P. Drolet, J.K. Fraser, J. Poirier, E.J. Holmgren, R. McKinnon

REPORT ON CANADIAN PARTICIPATION

The First United Nations Conference

on the Standardization of

Geographical Names

GENEVA 1967 GENÈVE

La Première

Conférence des Nations unies

sur la normalisation des noms géographiques

RAPPORT DE LA PARTICIPATION DU CANADA

OTTAWA
1968

CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIERES

APPENDICES

PREFACE

The United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical
Names, held in Geneva, Switzerland, during September 1967, brought
together geographers, cartographers, linguists, toponymists, historians
and other experts from fifty-four countries.

The conference had been called by the UN Secretary-General to find
ways of eliminating the confusion that often surrounds the names of towns,
rivers, mountains, lakes and other geographic features. This conference
marked the beginning of international work in the field of standardiza-
tion of geographical names, and although the problems could be expected
to increase in complexity and size, the wealth of talent and experience
which had been brought to bear on this first conference augured well for
the future.

Canada, which has had a national authority for the standardization
of geographical names since 1897, has accumulated a great deal of ex-
perience in this field. In this country, such problems are dealt with
by the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names with members
drawn from various federal departments having an interest in geography
or history, and a representative from each province. The Committee's
executive arm, the secretariat, is a unit of the Department of Energy,
Mines and Resources.

The Committee's chief means of disseminating its decisions is
the *Gazetteer of Canada* series. Gazetteers, containing lists of
geographical names and locations, have been published for all provinces,
except Newfoundland and Labrador, to be published this year, and Quebec,
expected to be completed in 1969. There are over 250,000 officially
approved names in Canada and this total is increasing at the rate of
about 2,000 each year.

The following report covers the main topics discussed at the
International Conference in Geneva. It has been prepared from official
documents and news releases issued at the Conference. The papers contri-
buted by the members of the Canadian Delegation are reproduced as well as

the reports of the committees and the recommendations adopted by the
Conference.

To complete the general information pertaining to the Conference, a
list of all delegates and countries represented as well as a list of
papers contributed by the various delegations have been added as appendices.
The twelve principles of nomenclature that guide the decisions of the
Canadian Permanent Committee are also included. Parts of this report are
presented in both French and English, but it was not considered necessary
to present all chapters in both languages.

It is more by coincidence than because of a profound knowledge of
toponymy that the chairman of the Canadian Permanent Committee holds this
post. I may add, however, that my interest in the science of names goes
back to the very beginning of my professional career in mineral explo-
ration when I often found that the maps available for the territories ex-
plored showed numerous geographical features without any names. In order
to identify landmarks as well as to render the lake, the river, the
mountain and the valley that had become working areas more meaningful, one
of my first preoccupations was to give names based either on local history
or the shape of the surrounding relief; and because of the remoteness of
the place, the names were sometimes marked with a touch of romance. In
this regard, people of this country have not changed very much; on the
ancient maps drawn by the early explorers and surveyors, beautiful names
can be found that not only identify geographical features but also tell a
story. To the Indians and Eskimos, first inhabitants of the country, we
owe a great number of descriptive toponyms. When the Montagnais of Québec
talk about Lac *Manicouagan*, they know that it is "where you can have a
drink of water", but it is to the first European explorers and settlers
that we owe the introduction of anthroponyms and patronyms to designate
the new places. When Samuel de Champlain named Ile *Sainte-Hélène*, fami-
liar to millions as part of the site of Expo 67, his purpose was to honour
both his wife Hélène Boullé and her patron saint. Thus toponymy, the
science of geographical names, is of interest to the general public no
less than to the professional historian, linguist or geographer or to
those concerned with the production of maps.

Jean-Paul Drolet, Chairman,
Canadian Permanent Committee
on Geographical Names.

La Conférence des Nations Unies sur la normalisation des noms géographiques tenue à Genève, Suisse, au cours du mois de septembre 1967, a réuni des géographes, cartographes, linguistes, toponymistes, historiens et autres experts de cinquante-quatre pays.

La Conférence fut convoquée par le Secrétaire Général des Nations Unies dans le but de trouver les moyens de remédier à la confusion que causent souvent les noms de villes, rivières, montagnes, lacs et autres accidents géographiques. Cette première Conférence marque le début du travail au niveau international dans le domaine de la normalisation des noms géographiques, et malgré la complexité des problèmes étudiés, il semble que l'échange de données au cours de ces premières assises augure favorablement pour l'avenir.

Le Canada, dont l'autorité pour la normalisation des noms géographiques remonte à 1897, possède une assez grande expérience dans ce domaine. Au Canada, les problèmes de normalisation sont réglés par le Comité permanent canadien des noms géographiques formé de représentants des divers ministères du gouvernement fédéral intéressés à la géographie et à l'histoire et d'un représentant de chacune des provinces. Le secrétariat de ce comité, relève du ministère de l'Energie, des Mines et des Ressources.

La série des *Répertoires de noms géographiques du Canada* constitue le principal moyen dont dispose le Comité pour la diffusion de ses décisions. Des répertoires contenant la liste des accidents géographiques, leurs noms et leurs emplacements, ont été publiés pour toutes les provinces du Canada, à l'exception de deux: Terre-Neuve -- Labrador, qui le sera cette année, et Québec, dont on prévoit la publication au cours de 1969. Le Comité a jusqu'à ce jour approuvé officiellement plus de 250,000 noms au Canada et ce nombre augmente à raison d'environ 2,000 par année.

Le présent rapport couvre les principaux sujets étudiés au cours de la Conférence internationale de Genève. Ces notes ont été préparées à partir de documents officiels et de communiqués de presse publiés durant la Conférence. Les travaux présentés par les membres de la délégation canadienne sont inclus dans le présent rapport de même que les rapports des comités et le texte complet des recommandations de la Conférence.

Une liste de tous les délégués des pays représentés ainsi que la liste des mémoires présentés par les délégations ont été ajoutées en appendice. Il nous a aussi paru utile de compléter ce rapport en ajoutant quelques notes sur les Principes de nomenclature appliqués par le Comité permanent canadien des noms géographiques. Quelques parties de ce rapport sont présentées en français et anglais, mais il n'a pas paru nécessaire de traduire tous les chapitres dans les deux langues.

C'est dû au hasard beaucoup plus qu'à des connaissances étendues en toponymie que l'actuel président du Comité permanent canadien occupe cette intéressante fonction. Je me permets cependant d'ajouter que mon intérêt dans ce domaine remonte au tout début de ma carrière professionnelle en exploration minière alors que très souvent les seules cartes disponibles pour les territoires explorés présentaient de nombreuses entités géographiques sans noms.

Dans le double but d'identifier les points de repère et de rendre plus vivants le lac, la rivière, la montagne et la vallée devenus des lieux de travail, on avait vite fait de leur donner un nom basé tantôt sur un rappel historique tantôt sur les formes du relief environnant, mais à cause de l'éloignement les noms étaient souvent marqués d'une pointe de romanesque. A ce sujet les hommes de mon pays n'ont guère changé car les cartes anciennes tracées par les premiers explorateurs et arpenteurs sont couvertes de jolis noms qui en plus d'identifier les lieux racontaient toute une histoire.

C'est aux Indiens et aux Esquimaux, premiers habitants du pays, que l'on doit un grand nombre de toponymes descriptifs. C'est ainsi que lorsque les Montagnais de mon pays parlent du lac *Manicouagan*, ils savent aussi que c'est "là où l'on donne à boire", alors que les premiers Européens qui ont visité et colonisé notre pays introduisirent l'emploi d'anthroponymes et de patronymes pour désigner les lieux nouveaux. Lorsque Samuel de Champlain nomma l'île *Sainte-Hélène* que visitèrent des millions de touristes au cours de l'Expo '67, il voulut à la fois honorer son épouse Hélène Boullé et sa sainte patronne.

C'est ainsi que la toponymie ou science des noms de lieux, présente à tous autant d'intérêt qu'à l'historien, le linguiste, le géographe ou celui qui doit tracer les cartes géographiques.

Jean-Paul Drolet, Président,
Comité Permanent Canadien
des Noms Géographiques

I - INTRODUCTION

In accordance with a decision made by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations at the 1385th meeting of its thirty-ninth session held on July 16, 1967, the United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names convened at the Palais des Nations in Geneva, Switzerland, from September 4 to September 22, 1967.

Invitations to attend this Conference were sent to the governments represented at the United Nations. The secretary-general of the UN, Mr. U. Thant, urged the governments to nominate experts in order to set up guidelines for designating geographic names on a standardized basis both nationally and internationally. Such standardization is deemed essential to improve the accuracy of maps needed for economic and social development projects all over the world.

The organization of the Conference was under the auspices of the UN and Mr. Horacio M. Ureta was appointed by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs to serve as executive secretary for the Conference, while Mr. Chris N. Christopher of the Cartography Section, Resources and Transport Division of the UN Secretariat, served as deputy executive secretary. The secretary-general of the UN was represented by Mr. Roberto Arce.

The marked interest in this Conference was immediately shown by the large number of countries which appointed geographers, cartographers, linguists and toponymists to attend the meeting. Invitations were also sent to a number of international organizations concerned with geography, cartography, hydrography, communications and linguistics. In addition to specialized agencies of the United Nations family, the UN Economic and Social Office in Beirut and the UN Regional Economic Commission were also invited.

The UN Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names is part of the UN effort to assist member states to develop their mapping capabilities. Related to the production of the International Map of the world at 1:1,000,000, a series of regional and inter-regional cartographic conferences and seminars have been held to provide for an exchange of skills and information between experts and officials in

developed and developing areas. Technical assistance has included arrange-
ments for visits by specialists to advise developing countries on problems
of mapping and surveying. On a larger scale, the UN Development Programme
is assisting several governments (Ceylon, India, Jamaica and Pakistan) to
strengthen their surveying and cartographic services.

In response to requests from the Economic and Social Council, the
UN organized two preparatory meetings of a Group of Experts on geograph-
ical names. The first, in 1960, considered the problems of domestic
standardization of names and the desirability of an international confer-
ence. Following the decision in 1965 to hold this conference, the Group
of Experts was reconvened in 1966 to assist in preparations.

The Group of Experts agreed that "standardization from the geographi-
cal point of view appears not only desirable, but even necessary", noted
that the need for rapid development had caused governments to undertake
large projects requiring accurate maps, and recorded that "the lack of
standardized names has caused difficulty in the work of map makers,
statisticians, census takers and others, leading to undue and harmful
delay and mistakes".

The Group of Experts added: "The effects of confusion in geograph-
ical names are felt not only by geographers and those concerned with
national and international affairs, since geographical names constitute
one of the required elements of identification in administrative and
legal documents, but also by individuals, since people all over the
world now have occasion to refer to, identify, or even go to a place
that their ancestors either never heard of or considered so far away and
inaccessible as to be of no concern".

Among problems recognized by the Group of Experts were: How to
select one geographical name from several being used for the same feature?
How to establish a common usage for place names both nationally and inter-
nationally? What to do about the duplication of names? How to write a
name in another language with a different alphabet or even an entirely
different set of written symbols, such as transcribing into Roman letters
a place originally written in Japanese ideographs?

The goal of the Experts was to find answers to these problems in
order to eliminate the confusion often surrounding the names of towns,
rivers, mountains and other geographic features. In the report on its
first meeting, the Group of Experts set forth 21 recommendations dealing
with measures that governments could take to standardize geographical
names within their countries as an initial step towards international
standardization.

Heading the list was the recommendation that each country establish a
national names authority if it did not already have one. The makeup and
functions of such a standardizing body should be appropriate to the
governmental structure and the needs of a country.

In reporting on its second meeting, the group posed a series of
specific objectives for the conference. These included:

- Removal of any remaining doubt that nationally standardized names are the proper basis for international standardization and that an international alphabet is not feasible;

- Development of a greater willingness on the part of each country to take account, in its standardization programme, of the problems that other countries might encounter in receiving and using those geographical names for their own use. This process would involve, on the part of the donor country, all the elements of the original scripts and other linguistic details necessary for conversion into other scripts;

- Identification of topics, areas and categories of names which currently merit further study, and formulation of principles relating to international standardization;

- International standardization from other writing systems into the United Nations Roman-Alphabet languages: English, French and Spanish;

- Consideration to be given to the establishment of systems for international standardization based on the Cyrillic alphabet (used in the Soviet Union and other countries) and the Arab alphabet;

- Development of machinery for international exchange of information;

- Promotion of the establishment of names standardization bodies in all countries.

Following these recommendations and with reference to the specific objectives established for the conference, a provisional agenda was prepared and submitted to the various interested governments, soliciting their comments. Some 34 countries submitted papers reporting progress made and problems encountered in names standardization. There were also submissions from scientific organizations. Several documents of general interest were prepared by the UN Secretariat. A complete list of these documents appears in Appendix I.

II - THE CONFERENCE

Mr. Vladimir Velebit, Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Europe, opened the Conference on behalf of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

A - ADOPTION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE

The Conference adopted at its first plenary meeting the same rules of procedure as those of the United Nations Technical Conference on the International Map of the World on the Millionth Scale (*United Nations publication E/CONF.40/8*, pp. 11-14), with amendments in rules 3, 32, 34 and 35, as follows:

> "Rule 3. A Credentials Committee shall be appointed at the beginning of the Conference. It shall consist of five members who shall be appointed by the Conference on the proposal of the President. It shall examine the credentials of representatives and report without delay."

> "Rule 32. If, when one person or one delegation is to be elected, no candidate obtains the required majority in the first ballot, a second ballot shall be taken, which shall be restricted to the two candidates obtaining the largest number of votes. If, in the second ballot, the votes are equally divided, the President shall decide between the candidates by drawing lots."

> "In the case of a tie in the first ballot among the candidates obtaining the second largest number of votes, a special ballot shall be held for the purpose of reducing the number of candidates to two. In the case of a tie among three or more candidates obtaining the largest number of votes, a second ballot shall be held; if a tie results among more than two candidates, the number shall be reduced to two by lot."

"Rule 34. English, French and Spanish shall be the working
languages of the Conference." *

"Rule 35. Speeches made in any one of the working languages shall
be interpreted into the other two working languages. Speeches
made in one of the official languages of the United Nations shall
be interpreted into the three working languages."

At its seventh plenary meeting the Conference made a further
amendment to rule 3 and amended rule 6 to read as follows:

"Rule 3. A Credentials Committee shall be appointed at the begin-
ning of the Conference. It shall consist of four members who shall
be appointed by the Conference on the proposal of the President.
It shall examine the credentials of representatives and report with-
out delay."

"Rule 6. The Conference shall elect a President, a Vice-President
and a Rapporteur from among the representatives of the States
participating in the Conference."

B - OFFICERS OF THE CONFERENCE

The Conference elected the following officers:

President: Dr. Meredith F. Burrill (United States of America)
First Vice-President: Mr. A.N. Baranov (Union of Soviet
                        Socialist Republics)
Rapporteur: Dr. Guido Gomez de Silva (Mexico).

C - CREDENTIALS

The Credentials Committee, composed of the conference officers and
Mr. B.P. Lambert (Australia), reported that the credentials of all dele-
gates were in order. Fifty-four countries were represented, as well as
a number of inter-governmental and international organizations. A com-
plete list of participants appears in Appendix II.

---

*During the conference, there was also simultaneous translation
for Russian and Chinese.

D - AGENDA

The Conference adopted the following provisional agenda prepared by the
United Nations Secretariat:

1. Opening of the Conference
2. Adoption of the rules of procedure
3. Election of officers
4. Report on credentials
5. Adoption of the agenda
6. Organization of work
7. Reports by Governments on the progress made in the standardiza-
    of geographical names
8. Exchange of experience on problems identified in the Group of
    Experts' Report (see *World Cartography*, vol. VII, United
    Nations publication, Sales No.: 62.I.25).
9. National Standardization
    (a) Field collection of names
    (b) Office treatment of names
    (c) Decisions relating to multilingual areas
    (d) National gazetteers
    (e) Administrative structure of national names authorities
    (f) ADP (automatic data processing)
10. Geographical terms
    (a) Generic terms
    (b) Categories
    (c) Glossaries
    (d) Symbolization
11. Writing systems
    (a) Transfer of names from one writing system to another
        (i) into Roman
        (ii) into other writing systems
    (b) Writing of names from unwritten languages
12. International cooperation
    (a) Formation of a United Nations Permanent Commission of
        Experts on Geographical Names
    (b) Steps towards international standardization
    (c) Exchange of information
    (d) Post-conference regional meetings
    (e) Technical assistance
    (f) Treatment of names of features beyond a single sovereignty
    (g) Bibliography

13. Report of the Conference

E - TECHNICAL COMMITTEES

The Conference established four full-membership technical committees and
elected their officers from among the delegates:

Committee I - *National Standardization*

    Chairman: Mr. B.P. Lambert (Australia)
    Vice-Chairman: Prof. L. Ratajski (Poland)
    Rapporteur: Prof. E.F. Halvorsen (Norway)
        Mr. E.J. Holmgren (Canada) was appointed
        by the Chairman of this Committee to
        replace Mr. Halvorsen upon his departure.

Committee II - *Geographical terms*

    Chairman: Prof. F. Gall (Guatemala)
    Vice-Chairman: Dr. Y.M. Nawabi (Iran)
    Rapporteur: Mr. A. Rosu (Romania)

Committee III - *Writing Systems*

    Chairman: Mr. H.A.G. Lewis (United Kingdom)
    Vice-Chairman: Col. B. Khamasundara (Thailand)
    Rapporteur: Mr. A. Pégorier (France)

Committee IV - *International cooperation*

    Chairman: Dr. J. K. Fraser (Canada)
    Vice-Chairman: Mr. A. Matta (Lebanon)
    Rapporteur: Mr. J. Loxton (Kenya)

III - CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN THE CONFERENCE

Canada, having had a names authority for over 70 years, has accumulated a great deal of expertise in the field of geographical names derived chiefly from our linguistic groups - Indian, Eskimo, French and English. Many other names originate from the languages of other immigrant groups. Canada was therefore in a good position to exchange experience with other nations, many of which were newcomers in names standardization and which also had to deal with a plurality of languages and dialects.

It was in particular the acquired administrative and technical experience that the Canadian delegation was able to contribute to the Conference, while at the same time learning from other participants different approaches to compilation, progress in computerization of names, as well as gaining an appreciation of the international aspects of problems of geographical names.

The official delegation was drawn from the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names which is composed of representatives of federal and provincial government departments concerned with geography, cartography or history. The Canadian delegation included:

    Mr. Jean-Paul Drolet, Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of
        Energy, Mines and Resources and Chairman of the Committee;
    Dr. J. Keith Fraser, Executive Secretary, Canadian Permanent
        Committee on Geographical Names;
    Mr. Jean Poirier, Sécretaire, Comité de Géographie de la Province
        de Québec;
    Mr. Eric J. Holmgren, Secretary, Geographic Board of Alberta;
    Mr. Richard McKinnon, First Secretary, Canadian Permanent Mission
        to the United Nations in Geneva, representing the Department
        of External Affairs;
    Mr. Henri Dorion, professor of geography at Laval University,
        attended some of the sessions as an observer.

The members of the Canadian delegation contributed to the discussion of the problems (Agenda item 8) and reported on progress made in the standardization of geographical names in Canada. Canada tabled papers describing the organization of a national names authority and the preparation of national gazetteers. The papers reproduced in this report were distributed to participants prior to or during the Conference.

A

PROGRESS REPORT ON THE
STANDARDIZATION OF GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES IN CANADA*

Je désire d'abord exprimer, au nom du gouvernement du Canada que j'ai l'honneur de représenter, notre appréciation pour l'occasion qui nous est offerte de participer à cette conférence et présenter quelques remarques sur la contribution que le Canada peut apporter aux délibérations des prochains jours.

La délégation du Canada, formée de trois membres du Comité permanent canadien des noms géographiques, comprend: M. Jean Poirier, secrétaire du Comité de géographie de la province de Québec; M. E.J. Holmgren, secrétaire du Comité géographique de l'Alberta; le Dr. J.K. Fraser, secrétaire exécutif du Comité permanent, ainsi que moi-même qui ai l'honneur de présider le comité.

Le Comité permanent canadien des noms géographiques a remplacé la Commission géographique du Canada qui avait été établie en 1897, afin de s'occuper de la normalisation des noms géographiques au Canada à une époque où le développement de la géographie à travers tout le pays nécessitait la création d'un tel organisme. Il va sans dire qu'au cours de ces 70 années, nous avons maintes fois rencontré les problèmes mentionnés à l'ordre du jour de la présente réunion. A cause des caractéristiques variées de notre géographie, nous avons aussi connu plusieurs des problèmes communs aux pays qui sont ici représentés. Il est évident que si l'on nous compare aux pays d'Europe, on peut dire que le Canada est un pays très jeune. Cependant, comme nous célébrons cette année le centenaire de notre Confédération, peut-être apparaissons-nous comme un vieux pays aux yeux de ceux qui ont acquis leur indépendance tout récemment.

Le Canada possède l'héritage de deux nations fondatrices - française et anglaise - qui non seulement se reflète dans notre culture et notre façon de vivre, mais aussi dans notre toponymie. De plus, nous y trouvons de nombreux noms dérivés des langues indigènes - indienne et esquimaude - et autres langues qui sont celles de nombreux immigrants dans notre vaste pays.

---

*presented by J-P. Drolet, at the opening session of the Conference.

Il y a présentement au Canada 225,000 Indiens disséminés dans tout le pays et répartis en groupes culturels distincts formant une dizaine de familles linguistiques. Quant aux Esquimaux, ils sont environ 13,000 qui vivent principalement dans les territoires du nord où leur population devrait doubler dans une vingtaine d'années. Pour ce qui est des autres groupes ethniques du Canada, plus du quart des habitants sont d'origine autre qu'anglaise ou française, bien que 60 p. 100 des 20 millions d'habitants soient de langue anglaise et environ 30 p. 100 de langue française. Le grande variété des langues en usage est bien illustrée par les 180 publications en 27 langues étrangères qui paraissent régulièrement au Canada.

Avec votre permission, monsieur le président, j'aimerais poursuivre ces remarques dans l'autre langue officielle de mon pays, réservant pour les experts en linguistique quelques mots en langue indienne et en langue esquimaude alors que nous siégerons dans des comitée spéciaux, car je dois avouer que l'usage des langues indienne et esquimaude est plutôt restreint au Canada.

The federal system of government - a central national government and ten provincial governments - has influenced the approach to toponymy developed in Canada over the past 70 years. While recognizing the need for a centralizing authority over geographical nomenclature, the prerogatives of the provinces are recognized in the matter of names falling within their respective boundaries. This concept is essential in a country extending 3200 miles (5149 Km) from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and 2800 miles (4480 Km) from the United States border to the High Arctic, a country of infinite physiographic variety and of differing historical development.

The necessity to standardize geographical names in a young nation undergoing the consolidation and spread of settlement around the turn of the last century has provided the opportunity for Canada to develop practical rules of nomenclature and a rational approach to the names on the land. We have endeavoured with some success to produce a national gazetteer, published according to province, which provides an up-to-date registry of all geographical names and is designed for the convenience of the official or public user. Canada has developed procedures whereby current name decisions are disseminated to the map and chart producers and to other agencies, especially those dealing with communications, which require up-to-date information on names. Field investigations depending mainly on local interviews but drawing on all sources of documented information have already demonstrated their effectiveness in clarifying local nomenclature. Our observations on these matters in particular, we feel, will be the main contributions of Canada to this conference. However, I wish to emphasize that we have also come to learn, for there are several aspects of name standardization in which we continue to have problems, and we have not developed certain techniques, such as computerization of names, in which we have a strong interest.

To those interested, I am pleased to present pamphlets which describe the functions and responsibilities of the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names and in which are listed the twelve principles of nomenclature that guide the decisions of the Committee. We have also for examination a limited number of examples of the *Gazetteer of Canada* and the semi-annual Supplements in which current name decisions are published.

I wish to close by indicating the interest of Canada in the proposed United Nations Permanent Commission, in the continued exchange of information following this conference and in the suggested post-conference regional meetings. These concepts we feel to be valid and necessary to the complete success of the objectives of this conference.

B

EXCHANGE OF EXPERIENCE ON PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED IN THE REPORT
OF THE GROUP OF EXPERTS *

Problems of Domestic Standardization of Geographical Names

(a) <u>How to determine the actual name and its correct writing. What weight
should be given to published usage, local usage established by field
investigation or historical evidence under various conditions?</u>

At present, the spelling, form and application of 95 per cent of the
geographical names in Canada are accepted. Standardization has been pro-
ceeding for seventy years, yet field investigations disclose variations in
local usage, unrecorded names of long standing, locally accepted corrup-
tions and names no longer known or in use. The investigative methods used
in field studies in Canada are by interview, often followed up or expanded
by correspondence. Avoidance of leading questions in interviews is
essential, as is also the development of the acumen of the interviewer in
determining the competence of those he interviews. Only occasionally is
significant illiteracy encountered, to the degree that the correct spelling
of a name cannot be verified, but semi-illiteracy or disinterest may
mislead the unwary interviewer.

Conflict may occur between local usage and establishment in documents,
in particular maps. It is infrequent that the local residents are conver-
sant with the nomenclature established on topographic maps, though the
owners of small pleasure craft or commercial fishermen are usually well
aware of toponymic errors on navigation charts. Commercial road maps re-
flect the nomenclature on topographic maps and tend to advertise local
names more widely than other kinds of published maps.

In most cases, names with local or public usage should take precedence
over names with establishment in documents, even if the latter demonstrably
represents the earliest historical name. It has been found that local
residents resist any attempt to have a name forced upon them that is
different from that in local use. This lack of success in name-changing
is naturally most pronounced when an entirely different name is proposed,
but occasionally even minor changes in form result in enthusiastic opposi-
tion.

_____

*Prepared by J.K. Fraser

Field interviews are not always satisfactory, as polls may not provide conclusive results. Some arbitrary decision must be taken in such cases and the action publicized locally. The cooperation of local newspapers, highway officials responsible for erecting signs, local historical societies or community groups can all be used to promote the selected name and eventually achieve some measure of general acceptance.

It is unlikely that local interviews can contribute effectively to the selection of the most appropriate orthography for a native name. Residents are not likely to be seriously opposed to minor changes in the spelling of Indian names, except for operators of commercial establishments who make use of the name in promoting their businesses. With other names, however, historical records may indicate that a corrupted form of the original name has unwittingly gained acceptance. If the change is slight, some effort should be made to correct it, but a radical change should not be forced on the local residents simply for the sake of historical accuracy.

(b) How to determine the extent of physical features to which names properly apply, such as the limits of a mountain range or of a bay. Again, what weight should be given to published usage, local usage or historical evidence?

The application of a name to a feature, especially those types of features with contentious limits (ranges, bays, sounds, streams, archipelagoes, plateaus, etc.), may require discussion between specialists in physiography, international law or surveyors before a suitable agreement is reached. The extent of the larger features are not usually of concern to the general public who may, however, have certain strong opinions about the application of a local name for the entirety or a portion of a stream.

The limits of a mountain range or plateau should be decided as far as possible on the basis of physiographic homogeneity. Significant topographic breaks should form the boundaries but if published usage (in explorers' journals, geological reports, etc.) transgresses the natural limits, it may be desirable to extend the application of the name. A water feature such as a bay or sound is normally enclosed from headland to headland; if published usage in a pilot or other navigational document is long established, the application should not be altered except after careful consideration or if it is obviously quite inappropriate.

One of the principles of nomenclature in Canada specifically states that to apply different names to different sections of a river is an undesirable practice, even when the different sections are separated by lakes. Obviously this principle cannot be implemented in all cases, but our practice is to attempt to apply the same name from headwaters to mouth. In settled areas, persons living near the headwaters of relatively small streams may identify it by a name different from those persons living downstream. One name may have as much validity as the other and the only solution may be to make an arbitrary decision and attempt to convince those using the discarded name to accept the official one. Depending on the circumstances, it may be possible to apply the upstream name to a portion of the river as far down as its junction with an unnamed tributary, and to apply the downstream name to the headwaters of that tributary. In

most cases, however, it is preferable that the tributary should have a name different from the trunk stream.

As in the previous problem, greater weight is given to local usage than to other factors, but in unsettled regions, a name with establishment on historical maps or in old reports should be retained in preference to a newly adopted name.

(c) How to select one name from several having some basis for acceptance

Local usage should apply in the selection of one of several alternate names. If such local usage is not decisive, the principle involving duplication might be employed, or that concerning brevity.

(d) What to do about (1) names for parts of natural features that have names in their entirety, and (2) names for large features for which only parts have names

In the case of streams, the comments under (b) are applicable here. It is emphasized that this is a particularly difficult problem in settled areas, and it is Canadian practice that one name only be applied to the main trunk of a stream. In the case of lakes, it is preferable to name the whole using the generic term *lake* and parts of the whole using the generic terms *bay, arm* or *inlet*. If two lakes at the same level are joined by a narrow channel, each may be named using the generic *lake*. The general principle of unambiguous identification of each entity governs this problem.

(e) How to treat existing names from unwritten languages or from minority languages (written or unwritten) or from dialects and regional forms of the principal languages

In Canada, this concerns names derived from Indian and Eskimo words, and has been a problem ever since the first Europeans began transliterating the native names they encountered into the English or French alphabets. The lack of written languages and the wide variety of dialects gave rise to innumerable spellings for the same idea or thing. These variants became established on maps and in the literature and became accepted and stabilized especially in the more settled southern fringe of the country. Where different spellings for the same meanings are widely separated geographically, it is preferable that no attempt be made to standardize them. In many cases, the names may have only a spurious resemblance to one another and originally may have had quite different meanings, now lost in obscurity. Even in closely adjacent regions, the different orthographies used by French and English have resulted in slightly differing forms of the same names e.g., *Timiskaming* in Ontario, *Témiscaminque* in Quebec; *Restigouche* in New Brunswick, *Ristigouche* in Quebec. Where such variants are firmly fixed, they should be accepted.

(f) How to choose between syntactical or grammatical variations of the same name

Not applicable in Canadian toponymy.

15

(g) What to do about optional parts of certain names which serve as part
     of titles or to distinguish places of the same name

Canadian policy is to insist that the whole of the approved name be used on
maps or in documents and to discourage the use of "optional" name elements
entirely. Fortunately there are very few names which allow this problem
to arise. One type of name includes those having the prefix *Fort*. For
example, *Fort Simpson* is the approved name and Simpson is incorrect usage.
In actual practice, *there is no option*. Colloquial variants occur, such as
"The Hat" for *Medicine Hat*, "Tuk" for *Tuktoyaktuk* or "P.O.V." for
Povungnituc. The names of post offices serving some communities differ
from the statutory name of the settlement, such as Niagara-on-the-lake
(p.o.)for *Niagara* and Valleyfield (p.o.) for *Salabry-de-Valleyfield*.
These differences are necessary to eliminate the possibility of mis-
direction of mail, but only the community name would appear on official
maps.

(h) What criteria should be established for retention of established names
     vs. substitution of new names?

The Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names recently approved an
addition to the *Guiding Principles of Nomenclature* as follows: "Estab-
lished names which have proved acceptable and satisfactory should not be
changed or altered." It is considered justifiable to change a name that
is blatantly unacceptable because of the likelihood of confusion due to
duplication, or because it has become objectionable due to changing mores.
Minor alterations may be effected for the sake of grammatical purity or
the discovery that a feature had been named using the wrong spelling in
commemorating a person. Occasionally the Committee will advise that the
old name be printed on maps in brackets in conjunction with the new one,
to allow proper identification until the new name becomes accepted.

(i) How much control of commemorative naming should be exercised, and in
     what manner?

The principles of nomenclature which guide the decisions of the Canadian
Permanent Committee on Geographical Names include one concerning personal
names, which reads as follows:

> *"Personal names should not be used unless it is in the public interest
> to honour a person by applying his name to a geographical feature.
> The application of a personal name during the lifetime of the person
> concerned should only be made in exceptional circumstances. Owner-
> ship of land should never in itself be grounds for the application
> of the owner's or donor's name to a geographical feature contained
> therein."*

Though this is not a mandatory regulation, the intent is to discourage
the practice of naming features after living persons. The Committee views
this principle as a protection against political pressure. Each violation
of this principle establishes a precedent and makes it more difficult to
reject subsequent questionable proposals. In settled areas, it may be a
gracious gesture to commemorate the names of worthy pioneer families. In
unsettled regions, Canadian practice has been to commemorate the names of

Canadian servicemen who died in the service of their country during World
War II. Nearly 7,000 such names have been adopted. Nevertheless, identi-
fication of the feature is the prime reason and commemoration the secondary
one. Occasionally, a prominent feature is named to honour a person for
outstanding public service and in such cases there may be no urgent,
practical need to identify the feature; in so doing, previously unnamed
features are selected. It is rare that approval is given to the naming of
a feature for a person who is still in public life.

(j) What to do about duplication of names, and when is it excessive?

Avoidance of duplication of names is considered a most important aspect of
the standardization of names in Canada. Non-duplication of names of popu-
lated places is of course the primary concern, for this is a potential cause
of confusion, especially to the postal authorities or transportation agencies.
It is unavoidable with some older names which are closely similar (*Saint
John*, New Brunswick; *St. John's*, Newfoundland; *Saint-Jean*, Quebec) or
identical (*Windsor* in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland); their
location in different provinces allows discrimination. New names of popu-
lated places, however, are carefully considered to prevent duplication.

Duplication of names of natural features is less strict, the general
policy being to avoid duplication of the names of major features within a
province, whereas for a minor feature in a settled area, the limit need
not be beyond the area of a small administrative unit such as a township or
parish. Many examples occur of officially approved duplications. Two
major rivers in Canada bear the toponym *Churchill*; they are 1,300 miles
apart and thus are unlikely to be confused. *King Peak* occurs in British
Columbia and adjacent Yukon Territory; they are 600 miles apart in un-
settled country. There are twenty-seven officially recognized *Mud Lakes*
listed in the *Gazetteer of Ontario*; another seventy-eight are listed by
cross reference to the official names, indicating sometime usage of the
name. The decision is often a subjective one dependent partly on the
prevalence of public usage and exceptions are approved only when it is con-
sidered that no confusion may result.

(k) How to choose between systematic rendition vs. retention of forms in
     being, when they differ

As mentioned above (e), no consistent standardized orthography was available
until recently for Eskimo names in Canada. Linguists have now agreed on
an orthography which was developed mainly in northern Quebec and the eastern
Arctic but is applicable across the whole extent of Eskimo territory. Names
of Eskimo origin which come up for consideration on new maps, or as new
proposals, are approved according to the new orthography. The Province of
Que..., engaged in the development of their northern district and in the
pre. .ation of the *Gazetteer of Quebec*, is changing all Eskimo names, no
matter how well established in public use, into the new orthography. In
some cases it takes a discerning mind to comprehend that the former Keglo
is shown as *Queglo*, Korok as *Corok*, Kogaluk as *Cogaluc*. In the Northwest
Territories, among other changes, Takiyuak has become *Takijuq*, but no
attempt has yet been made to review the orthography of the great majority
of established Eskimo names.

The orthography of many Indian names in Quebec is also being altered, such as Nakwagami to *Naquagami*, Nestawkanaw to *Nestaocano*, Papachouesati to *Pepeshquasati*, Manuan to *Manouane*, Ashuapmuchuan to *Chamouchouane*, Kowatstakau to *Cauouatstacau*.

(1) <u>Shall printing form for names be made uniform and shall it agree with printing form for the language as a whole</u>?

In general, Canadian practice is to separate qualifying parts of a name, but there are exceptions where the unification of words has become accepted, e.g., *Thickwood Hills, Blackwater Creek, Greytrout Lake, Firetrail Creek, Redpine Island, Hanginghide Creek, Sixmile Brook*. There should be no difference between the form of a name on a map and that in running text. The only concession made to cartographers is to endorse the abbreviation *St* or *Ste* for Saint or Sainte in names of settlements or features. The generic term, of course, may be abbreviated at the discretion of the map producer.

(m) <u>What principles or policies can be adopted to reduce subjectivity in deciding names</u>?

Subjectivity in selecting new names is unavoidable. All names, except truly descriptive names, are to a greater or lesser degree contrived.

(n) <u>How to bring about local acceptance of nationally standardized names</u>

Under a democratic form of government, any attempt to bring name changes into acceptance by legislation will inevitably be frustrating to the standardizing body and irritating to the people concerned. Even slight changes in spelling or form of a name, no matter how well justified by grammatical rules or historical evidence, may evoke strong opposition (*Cortes Island*, B.C. is known locally as Cortez Island. Despite a decision of long standing, a recent complaint from local residents stated their preference for the form   Cortez.)

(o) <u>How to determine and express the location of geographic entities to a precision necessary for all needs</u>

For gazetteer purposes, Canadian practice is to locate geographic entities to the nearest minute. This is more than adequate for many large features and adequate for the smallest feature. There is seldom any need for any greater precision for named entities, in comparison with the necessity for high precision for benchmarks, geodetic stations, survey monuments, etc.

(p) <u>How to set up a standard designating procedure which will define geographical entities consistently and unambiguously</u>

Geographic features, in general, are what they are considered to be by the local people or those who come into direct contact with them. There is no precise definition of a *creek* in English-speaking countries. Locally, it is usually thought of as a stream less in volume and/or length than a river. But no firm rule may be laid down as to when a stream should be called a creek and when it should be called a river. A creek in one part of the country may be larger than a river in another part. A creek is a creek

if people refer to it as a creek. A *coulee* in western Canada may be either the valley containing a permanent or a seasonal stream, usually the latter, or it may refer to the water-course itself. It is recognized that this problem requires research. It may develop that some designator terms defy standardization in a national glossary.

(q) (1) How to write the names of all entities so that generic terms are distinguishable from designations accompanying names

Canadian practice is to indicate in gazetteers the kind of entity identified by a name having no generic part. If no generic term is listed in the name column (*The Palisades, The Gap, Hen and Chickens*), the user must assume that this is the whole of the name as officially approved. The designation column defines the feature (peaks, passage, rocks).

(q) (2) How to write the names of all entities so that abbreviations are unambiguous

Abbreviations must be nationally standardized and agreement reached between the names agency and the map-producing agencies so that there can be no ambiguity. The only problem of this nature in Canadian nomenclature is Brook (Bk.) and Branch (Br.) in mapping practice, Brook (Br.) and Branch (not abbreviated) in gazetteers.

(r) Not applicable in Canadian toponymy.

(s) Not applicable in Canadian toponymy.

(t) Not applicable in Canadian toponymy.

(u) How to provide such useful information on names as gender, position of stress and pronunciation

In Canada, no need exists for information on gender which is of importance in French language toponymy. The terminology logically follows French grammatical rules. In the matter of pronunciation, the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names is assisting the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in revising a handbook for announcers, showing stress and pronunciation for the more commonly used Canadian toponyms.

(v) How to set up a name-standardizing body in a country that does not have one

The standardizing names agency for Canada was created in 1897 and having passed through several functional reorganizations was established in 1961 as the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names. This committee includes representatives from federal government agencies with interests in nomenclature and a representative appointed by each of the ten provinces.

In setting up a names-standardization agency where no such organization presently exists, the main criteria to be considered should be *authority, workability* and *publicity*. Authority over all geographical names coming under the jurisdiction of the country should be vested by statute in the names agency and all government departments should be required to abide

by the decisions of this agency. Thus there must be some method of effective liaison between the names agency and those government bodies responsible for producing maps and charts (whether topographic, hydrographic or specialized maps), erecting highway signs, surveying, producing scientific or economic reports in which geographical names are used, planning commissions and archival institutions.

It is suggested that the advisory body should be composed of representatives of all agencies concerned with mapping, national archives and postal authorities and might well include specialists in geography and/or history from within or outside of government. These members should be appointed in the enacting legislation by virtue of their positions as executive directors of the various government agencies and provision made to appoint the extra-government members. Care should be taken to select the latter on the basis of their professed interest or competence; it should be stressed that their appointment is a working rather than an honorary function. It would be the responsibility of the names agency to adjudicate on all matters of contentious names and to formally recommend all new names or name changes. The names agency would be guided in its decisions by a set of rules of nomenclature which would be the first duty of the names agency to formulate, and it is suggested that they should be based on a thoughtful consideration of the various regulations presently in use by countries with names bodies of long standing, taking into account special circumstances or problems of their own country.

It is to be expected that the members of the names body will have other more pressing responsibilities and cannot be expected to devote a great deal of their time to the execution of decisions and none at all to the maintenance of records. Therefore it is recommended that a working staff to service the names body be established, headed by a competent secretary, whose responsibility would be the supervision of the day-to-day processing of names, maintenance of records and, with experience, to act on behalf of the names body in deciding on routine, non-contentious names.

It is recommended that the Minister of the Government responsible for the names body should not be required to personally approve all name decisions. It seems preferable that he delegate this authority to the chairman of the names body or the appointed secretary, reserving the right to make the final pronouncement on any particular name which might create public controversy or potential embarrassment to the Government. It is also suggested that unnecessary delay may result from the inclusion in the legislation of a requirement that all name decisions become final only after publication in the Press or a State gazette.

Name decisions must be disseminated in some manner so as to publicize them as widely as possible and promote their country-wide acceptance and use. This may be done to some degree by their appearance in an official State gazette but should also be followed or accompanied by the preparation and publication of a national gazetteer, revised from time to time as the need may arise. This gazetteer should identify each named entity by name, designate the appropriate generic term, and locate it by some system of geographical co-ordinates. It may be convenient to publish current decisions at regular or irregular intervals in the interim between revisions of the national gazetteer.

B

ECHANGE DE DONNES D'EXPERIENCE CONCERNANT LES PROBLEMES
ENONCES DANS LE RAPPORT DU GROUPE D'EXPERTS*

Problèmes de normalisation nationale des noms géographiques

(a) Comment déterminer le nom actuel et sa graphie correcte: quel poids
doit être donné à l'usage écrit, à l'usage local mis en évidence par
enquête sur le terrain, ou à l'usage historique dans certaines condi-
tions?

L'orthographe, la forme et l'utilisation de 95% des noms géographiques cana-
diens sont maintenant entrées dans les moeurs. Bien que leur normalisation
soit en cours depuis 70 ans, des enquêtes sur le terrain révèlent l'existence
de variantes dans les usages locaux, de noms de vieille date non enregistrés,
de corruptions admises localement et de noms qui ne sont plus connus, ni
employés. Les méthodes employées au Canada pour enquêter sur le terrain con-
sistent en interrogations orales, souvent suivies ou complétées par un échan-
ge de correspondance. Il est essentiel que l'enquêteur évite les questions
tendancieuses et qu'il développe sa perspicacité à déterminer la compétence
des personnes qu'il interroge. On a rarement affaire à des personnes à tel
point illettrées que la vérification de l'orthographe correcte d'un nom
est impossible. Cependant, le semi-analphabétisme ou l'absence d'intérêt
peuvent induire en erreur l'enquêteur qui n'est pas sur ses gardes.

Il se peut que les noms utilisés localement ne concordent pas avec ceux
qui sont consacrés par des documents ou par certaines cartes. La population
locale n'est que rarement familiarisée avec la nomenclature des cartes topo-
graphiques. Toutefois, les propriétaires de petits bateaux de plaisance et
les pêcheurs professionels sont d'ordinaire bien au courant des erreurs topo-
nymiques que contiennent les cartes marines. Les cartes routières d'usage
courant utilisent une nomenclature qui s'inspire de celle des cartes topo-
graphiques et font plus, pour répandre la connaissance des noms locaux, que
ne le feraient les autres catégories de cartes publiées.

Dans la plupart des cas, les noms dont l'usage est local ou public de-
vraient être préférés à ceux consacrés par des documents, même s'il est
avéré que ceux-ci sont historiquement plus anciens. On a constaté que la
population locale résiste à tous les efforts visant à lui imposer un nom
différent de celui qu'elle utilise. Ces tentatives rencontrent évidemment
encore moins de succès lorsque le nom proposé est tout à fait différent de

―――――――――――――――――
*Présenté par J.K. Fraser

21

celui en usage jusqu'alors. Cependant, même des changements mineurs de la forme d'un nom donnent parfois lieu à une opposition vigoureuse.

Les enquêtes sur le terrain ne sont pas toujours concluantes, car il peut arriver que les sondages ne donnent pas des résultats probants. Dans de tels cas, une décision arbitraire s'impose, décision qui doit être rendue publique sur le plan local. La collaboration des journaux locaux, des services officiels chargés de la mise en place des signaux routiers, des sociétés historiques locales ou des collectivités est utile pour faire connaître le nouveau nom choisi et finir par le faire accepter dans une certaine mesure par l'ensemble de la population.

Il est peu probable que des interrogatoires menés sur place soient utiles pour déterminer le choix de l'orthographe la plus indiquée d'un nom indigène. La population locale ne s'opposera guère de façon sérieuse à des changements peu importants de l'orthographe des noms indiens. Les seules personnes à le faire seront les administrateurs d'établissements commerciaux qui utilisent le nom en question à des fins publicitaires. Cependant, les registres historiques peuvent révéler, dans le cas d'autres noms indigènes, Cependant, les registres historiques peuvent révéler, dans le cas d'autres noms indigènes, qu'une forme corrompue du nom original a été adoptée pour ainsi dire inconsciemment. Si l'altération est légère, on doit tenter de la rectifier. Toutefois, un nom radicalement différent du nom en usage ne devrait pas être imposé à la population locale par seul souci de l'exactitude historique.

(b) Comment déterminer l'étendue des détails topographiques naturels auxquels les noms s'appliquent exactement, telle que les limites d'une chaîne de montagnes ou d'une baie? En outre, quel poids devrait être donné à l'usage écrit, à l'usage local ou au renseignement historique?

L'application d'un nom à un détail topographique, notamment lorsqu'il s'agit de détails qui ne sont pas délimités avec précision (chaînes de montagne, baies, bras de mer, cours d'eau, archipels, plateaux, etc.) peut nécessiter des consultations entre spécialistes en matière de physiographie et de droit international et géomètres avant qu'il ne soit possible d'aboutir à un accord acceptable. Le grand public est en général indifférent à l'étendue des détails topographiques importants, mais il peut parfois avoir des idées très arrêtées quant à l'utilisation d'un nom local pour désigner l'ensemble ou une partie d'un cours d'eau.

Les limites d'une chaîne de montagnes ou d'un plateau doivent être déterminées, dans toute la mesure du possible, en fonction de son homogénéité physiographique. Les grandes failles topographiques devraient en constituer les limites naturelles. Mais, si l'usage écrit (journaux d'explorateurs, études géologiques, etc.) outrepassait les limites naturelles, il peut être souhaitable d'étendre l'application du nom employé. Un détail topographique maritime tel qu'une baie ou un bras de mer est habituellement compris entre deux pointes de terre; si la désignation qu'en donne un guide de pelotage ou quelque autre document servant à la navigation, est consacrée par l'usage, l'application ne devrait en être modifiée qu'après mûre réflexion ou que si elle est manifestement tout à fait inappropriée.

Un des principes de la nomenclature canadienne spécifie expressément que la pratique qui consiste à désigner les diverses parties d'un fleuve ou

d'une rivière par des noms différents est à proscrire, même si ces parties sont séparées les unes des autres par des lacs. Ce principe ne peut évidemment pas être respecté dans tous les cas. Cependant, la pratique canadienne consiste à essayer de désigner du même nom toute la rivière, du cours supérieur à l'embouchure. Dans les zones habitées, il arrive que les personnes vivant à proximité du cours supérieur d'un cours d'eau relativement peu important le désignent d'un nom différent de celui qu'on lui donne plus en aval. Il se peut que les deux noms soient tout aussi valables l'un que l'autre: la seule solution consiste à prendre une décision arbitraire et tenter de convaincre les personnes utilisant le nom qui a été écarté d'accepter la désignation officielle. Selon les circonstances, il peut être possible d'appliquer le nom du cours amont d'une rivière à la partie de cette rivière qui s'étend jusqu'à sa jonction avec un affluent n'ayant aucun nom et d'utiliser le nom de son cours aval pour désigner le cours supérieur de cet affluent. Cependant, dans la plupart des cas, il est préférable que l'affluent n'ait pas le même nom que la rivière principale.

Ce problème est résolu de la même manière que le précédent: on donne plus de poids à l'usage local qu'aux autres facteurs. Mais dans le cas de régions non habitées, on devrait retenir un nom déjà consacré par des cartes historiques ou par des documents anciens de préférence à un nom nouveau.

(c) Comment choisir un nom parmi plusieurs ayant tous des raisons valables d'être adoptés?

Le choix d'un nom parmi plusieurs autres devrait se faire en fonction de l'usage local. Si celui-ci n'est pas un facteur déterminant, on peut appliquer le principe de la non répétition ou celui de la brièveté.

(d) Que faire à propos i) des noms désignant des portions d'un détail topographique naturel dont l'ensemble a un nom, et ii) des noms appliqués à des détails topographiques naturels étendus dont seules des portions ont reçu un nom?

En ce qui concerne les cours d'eau, les remarques figurant sous b) peuvent s'appliquer ici. Ce problème est particulièrement difficile à résoudre dans les régions habitées. La pratique canadienne consiste à n'utiliser qu'un seul nom pour désigner le cours d'eau principal. Quant aux lacs, il est préférable de donner à l'ensemble de la masse d'eau un nom précédé du terme générique *lac* et d'en désigner séparément les parties en faisant précéder chaque nom du terme générique *baie, bras,* ou *anse.* Si deux lacs, situés au même niveau, sont reliés entre eux par un étroit chenal, on peut attribuer à chacun d'eux un nom précédé du terme générique *lac.* Ce problème doit être résolu par application du principe général relatif à l'identification précise de chaque entité.

(e) Quel traitement appliquer aux noms actuels tirés des langues non écrites, des langues des minorités (écrites ou non) ou des dialectes et formes régionales des langues principales?

Cette question concerne l'existence des noms dérivés de mots indiens ou esquimaux qui, au Canada, n'a cessé d'être un problème depuis l'époque où les premiers Européens commencèrent à translittérer les noms indigènes dans les alphabets anglais ou français. L'absence de langues écrites et la grande

variété des dialectes ont donné lieu à des orthographes innombrables pour le même concept ou objet. Ces variantes, consacrées ensuite par les cartes et par les textes écrits, furent progressivement adoptées et l'orthographe s'en est stabilisée, notamment dans la région de la frontière méridionale du pays, où les habitants étaient plus nombreux. Lorsqu'on constate que des orthographes différentes d'un même nom sont en usage dans des régions très distantes les unes des autres, mieux vaut ne pas essayer de les normaliser. Dans un bon nombre de cas, les noms ne présentent qu'une fausse ressemblance et il est possible qu'à l'origine ils aient eu des significations tout à fait différentes, aujourd'hui tombées dans l'oubli. Même dans des régions se touchant de près, les orthographes différentes utilisées en anglais et en français ont donné lieu à des formes légèrement différentes de certains noms: on dit *Timiskaming* dans l'Ontario et *Témiscamingue* dans le Québec, *Restigouche* dans le Nouveau-Brunswick et *Ristigouche* dans le Québec. Lorsque de telles variantes sont tout à fait entrées dans les moeurs, il faut les accepter.

(f) <u>Comment choisir entre les variantes grammaticales ou syntaxiques d'un même nom?</u>

Cette question ne s'applique pas à la toponymie canadienne.

(g) <u>Que faire des parties facultatives de certains noms qui sont utilisées comme parties du nom ou pour distinguer des lieux qui ont le même nom?</u>

La politique canadienne consiste à exiger que le nom agréé figure en entier sur les cartes ou les documents et à décourager complètement l'emploi des parties "facultatives" des noms. Il n'y a heureusement que très peu de noms au sujet desquels ce problème pourrait surgir. On peut citer ceux qui sont précédés du mot *Fort*. Par exemple, *Fort Simpson* est le nom agrée: Simpson est d'un emploi incorrect. Dans la pratique, en fait, *il n'y a pas d'alternative*. On enregistre des variantes familières telle que "The Hat" pour *Medicine Hat* "Tuk" pour *Tuktoyaktuk* ou "P.O.V." pour *Povungnituc*. Les noms des bureaux de poste desservant certaines collectivités sont différents du nom officiel de l'agglomération qu'ils désservent: à *Niagara* on trouve le bureau de poste de Niagara-on-the-lake et à *Salabry-de-Valleyfield*, celui de Valleyfield. Ces différences sont nécessaires si l'on veut éviter des erreurs d'acheminement du courrier. Cependant, seul le nom de la collectivité figurera sur les cartes officielles.

(h) <u>Quels critères retenir pour le maintien des noms consacrés ou leur remplacement par un nouveau nom?</u>

Le Comité permanent canadien des noms géographiques a approuvé récemment l'adjonction suivante aux *Principes directeurs de nomenclature:* "Les noms établis qui se sont avérés acceptables et satisfaisants ne devraient pas être changés ou modifiés." Si un nom est manifestement inacceptable parce qu'il risque de prêter à confusion par sa répétition ou que, par suite de l'évolution des moeurs, on peut lui trouver à redire, il est justifié de le changer. Il est permis d'effectuer de petites modifications de noms par souci de pureté grammaticale ou si l'on découvre que le nom donné à un détail topographique pour commémorer le souvenir de quelqu'un a été mal orthographié. Parfois, le Comité proposera que, sur les cartes l'ancien nom soit imprimé entre parenthèses, en plus du nouveau, afin de faciliter l'identification

des lieux jusqu'à l'adoption définitive du nouveau nom.

(i) <u>Dans quelle mesure doit-on contrôler l'utilisation des noms commémoratifs et de quelle manière?</u>

Parmi les principes de nomenclature auxquels obéissent les décisions du Comité, il en est un qui a trait aux noms de personnes, et qui est libellé comme suit:

> *Les noms de personnes ne doivent être utilisés que s'il est de l'intérêt public d'honorer une personne en donnant son nom à un détail géographique. On ne doit employer le nom d'une personne vivante que dans des cas exceptionnels. Le seul fait de posséder des terres ne devrait jamais justifier l'utilisation du nom du propriétaire ou du donateur du terrain pour désigner un élément géographique qui s'y trouve.*

Bien qu'il n'ait pas force de loi, ce principe a été élaboré en vue de décourager la pratique qui consiste à donner à un détail géographique le nom d'une personne vivante. Le Comité y voit une protection contre toute pression politique. Chaque dérogation à ce principe crée un précédent qui rend plus difficile le refus de propositions discutables présentées ulté-rieurement. Dans les régions habitées, on peut ainsi faire un geste pour commémorer les noms des familles de pionniers qui se sont distinguées. Dans les régions non habitées, la pratique canadienne consiste à commémorer les noms de combattants canadiens morts pour la patrie pendant la deuxième guerre mondiale. Près de 7,000 de ces noms ont été adoptés. L'identification de l'élément géographique n'en demeure pas moins l'objectif principal: la commémoration d'un nom est un objectif secondaire. Il arrive qu'on utilise, pour désigner un élément géographique important, le nom d'une per-sonne qui s'est dévouée de façon méritoire à la cause publique et qu'on désire honorer. En pareil cas, il peut n'y avoir pas urgence sur le plan pratique, à identifier l'élément en question et c'est la raison pour laquelle on choisit à cet effet des éléments géographiques qui ne portaient auparavant aucun nom. Il est rare que soit approuvé le choix d'un nom appartenant à une personne qui participe encore à la vie publique.

(j) <u>Que faire dans le cas de la répétition de noms et quand devient-elle excessive?</u>

Au Canada, un des aspects les plus importants de la normalisation des noms est celui qui consiste à éviter toute répétition. Cela est vrai surtout, évidemment, des noms de localités car il y a là une cause de confusion toujours possible, notamment pour les services postaux et les entreprises de transport. La confusion est inévitable dans le cas de certains noms anciens se ressemblant de très près (*Saint John* au Nouveau Brunswick; *St. John's* à Terre-Neuve; *Saint-Jean* au Québec) ou identiques (*Windsor* dans l'Ontario, le Québec, la Nouvelle-Ecosse et Terre-Neuve). Mais le fait que ces localités se trouvent dans des provinces différentes permet de les distinguer les unes des autres. Toutefois, les nouveaux noms de localités sont choisis avec soin de façon à écarter tout risque de répétition.

On est moins strict en ce qui concerne la répétition des noms de détails topographiques naturels. D'une façon générale, on cherche à éviter la ré-

pétition des noms d'entités géographiques importantes se trouvant dans une même province, alors que, pour les entités de moindre importance situées dans une région habitée, cette restriction n'est valable qu'à l'intérieur des limites d'une petite unité administrative telle qu'une bourgade ou une commune. Il y a un grand nombre de cas où la répétition de noms a été officiellement approuvée. Deux grandes rivières du Canada portent le topo-nyme de *Churchill*. Elles sont distantes l'une de l'autre de plus de 2.000 km et il est donc peu probable qu'on les confonde. Il y a un *King Peak* en Colombie britannique et un autre sur le territoire adjacent du Yukon. Ces deux sommets, séparés par une distance de près de 1.000 km, se trouvent dans des régions inhabitées. Il existe 27 *Mud Lakes* officiellement recensés dans le *Gazetteer of Ontario;* les 78 autres peuvent être trouvés en consultant la liste des noms officiels, qui comporte des renvois les concernant et qui in-dique parfois l'usage du nom. La décision prise à cet égard est souvent subjective et dépend en partie de la force de l'usage local. Les exceptions à la règle ne peuvent être approuvées que si l'on considère qu'elles ne constitueront pas une source de confusion.

(k) <u>Comment choisir entre la graphie uniforme d'un nom ou le maintien des formes existantes, en cas de différences?</u>

Ainsi qu'il est mentionné sous e) ci-dessus, ce n'est que depuis peu qu'il existe au Canada, une orthographe normalisée et uniforme des noms esquimau. Les linguistes se sont maintenant mis d'accord sur une orthographe qui a été principalement mise au point dans le Québec septentrional et l'Arctique oriental mais qui est applicable à l'ensemble du territoire esquimau. Les noms d'origine esquimau qu'on examine en vue de les faire figurer sur de nouvelles cartes, ainsi que toutes nouvelles propositions de noms, sont approuvés en tenant compte de la nouvelle orthographe. La province du Québec, qui s'occupe actuellement du développement de son district septentrional et de la rédaction du *Répertoire des noms géographiques du Québec*, a entrepris d'adapter tous les noms esquimau à la nouvelle orthographe, quelle que soit la mesure dans laquelle les usages locaux en ont consacré l'ancienne graphie. Il faut parfois faire preuve de perspicacité pour saisir que les anciens noms Keglo, Corok et Kogaluk sont devenus respectivement *Queglo*, *Corok* et *Cogaluc*. Dans les Territoires du Nord-Ouest, on peut relever entre autres changements, celui de Takiyak, qui est devenu *Takijuq*, mais aucune tentative n'y a encore été faite pour revoir l'orthographe de la plus grande partie des noms esquimau consacrés.

Le remaniement orthographique d'un grand nombre de noms indiens est actuellement en cours dans la province du Québec. Par exemple, Nakwagami a été remplacé par *Naquagami*, Nestawkanaw par *Nestaocano*, Papachouesati par *Pepeshquasati*, Manuan par *Manouane* Ashuapmuchuan par *Chamouchouane* et Kowatstakau par *Cauouatstacau*.

(1) <u>La composition typographique des noms doit-elle être uniformisée et correspondre à celle qui est employée pour la langue elle-même?</u>

En général, la pratique canadienne consiste à séparer les attributs qualitati-fs d'une nom mais il y a des exceptions (*Thickwood Hills, Blackwater Creek, Greytrout Lake, Firetrail Creek, Redpine Island, Hanginghide Creek, Sixmile Brook*) où l'agglutination des mots a été admise. Il ne devrait y avoir au-cune différence entre la forme d'un nom sur une carte et dans un texte cou-rant. La seule concession faite aux cartographes a été d'admettre de

l'abbréviation *St* ou *Ste* pour Saint ou Sainte dans les noms d'agglomérations ou d'éléments topographiques. Quant au terme générique, l'auteur de la carte est évidemment libre de le modifier comme il l'entend.

(m) <u>Quels principes ou règles peuvent être adoptés pour rendre les décisions, en matière de noms, moins subjectives?</u>

Il est inévitable que le choix de nouveaux noms soit subjectif. Tous les noms, à l'exception des noms vraiment descriptifs, sont plus ou moins inventés.

(n) <u>Comment faire accepter localement les noms normalisés à l'échelon national?</u>

Dans un régime démocratique, toute tentative visant à faire adopter des changements de nom par voie législative ne pourra être que décevante pour l'organisme chargé de la normalisation et irritante pour les intéressés. Même de légères modifications de l'orthographe ou de la forme d'un nom, si justifiées soient-elles pour des raisons grammaticales ou historiques, risquent de susciter une forte opposition *Cortes Island* , en Colombie britannique, est connue localement sous le nom de Cortez Island; en dépit d'une décision déjà ancienne, la population locale a fait savoir, dans une plainte déposée récemment, que ses préférences allaient à la forme Cortez).

(o) <u>Comment désigner et déterminer l'emplacement d'une entité géographique avec une précision nécessaire pour répondre à tous les besoins?</u>

Au Canada, la pratique adoptée aux fins de nomenclature consiste à localiser les entités géographiques à la minute près. Ce système, plus que suffisant pour de nombreux éléments topographiques de grande dimension est suffisant pour le plus petit élément. Il n'est presque jamais nécessaire de localiser de façon plus précise les entités qui portent un nom alors que la localisation des repères de nivellement, stations géodésiques, cairns de triangulation, etc. exige la plus grande précision.

(p) <u>Comment mettre sur pied un procédé de désignation normalisée qui pourra définir les entités géographiques d'une manière rationnelle et claire?</u>

Les détails géographiques sont généralement conformes à la conception que s'en font la population locale ou les personnes appelées à les voir de près. Dans les pays de langue anglaise, il n'y a pas de définition précise du terme *creek* Sur le plan local, ce mot évoque d'ordinaire l'idée d'un cours d'eau dont le volume ou la longueur ou les deux sont inférieurs à ceux d'une rivière (<u>river</u>). Mais il n'est pas possible d'établir une règle stricte qui stipulerait dans quel cas un cours d'eau s'appellera <u>creek</u> et dans quel cas <u>river</u>. Dans une partie du pays, le mot <u>creek</u> peut désigner un cours d'eau plus important qu'une rivière dans une autre partie du pays. Un <u>creek</u> est un <u>creek</u> si l'usage le veut ainsi. Le terme *coulee* désigne, dans l'Ouest du Canada, soit la vallée où coule un cours d'eau permanent ou saisonnier (le dernier cas est le plus fréquent), soit le cours d'eau lui-même. Ce problème nécessite certainement des recherches. On constatera peut-être un jour que certains termes de désignation défient toute normalisation dans un glossaire national.

(q.1) Comment écrire les noms de toutes les entités de façon que les termes
        génériques puissent être distingués des termes qui les accompagnent?

La pratique canadienne consiste à faire figurer dans les nomenclatures la
nature de l'entité désignée par un nom dépourvu d'élément générique. Si
aucun terme générique ne figure dans la colonne des noms *(The Palisades, The
Gap, Hen and Chickens)*,le lecteur doit présumer que le nom en question est
donné sous sa forme complète et officielle. Il consultera la colonne des
désignations pour avoir une définition du détail topographique (en l'occu-
rence pics, passage, rochers).

(q.2) Comment écrire les noms de toutes les entités de façon que les abré-
        viations ne soient pas ambigues?

Les abréviations doivent faire l'objet d'une normalisation nationale ainsi
que d'accords entre l'organisme chargé de mettre au point les noms géogra-
phiques et ceux qui sont chargés de dresser les cartes, afin qu'il n'y ait
pas d'ambiguité dans ce domaine. En ce qui concerne la nomenclature cana-
dienne, le seul problème de ce genre est celui que posent les mots Brook et
Branch qui donnent respectivement Bk. et Br. en cartographie, Br. et Branch
(non abrégé) dans les nomenclatures.

(r) Cette question ne s'applique pas à la toponymie canadienne.

(s) Cette question ne s'applique pas à la toponymie canadienne.

(t) Cette question ne s'applique pas à la toponymie canadienne.

(u) Comment fournir pour les noms géographiques des renseignements aussi
      utiles que le genre, la position de l'accent tonique et la prononciation?

Le Canada d'expression anglaise peut se passer de renseignements relatifs au
genre des mots; en revanche, il importe de connaître le genre pour la topo-
nymie d'expression française, dont la terminologie obéit logiquement aux
règles grammaticales françaises. En matière de prononciation, le Comité
permanent canadien des noms géographiques prête actuellement son concours à
la Canadian Broadcasting Corporation pour reviser un manuel destiné aux
annonceurs, qui indique les accents toniques et la prononciation des toponymes
canadiens les plus usités.

(v) Comment établir un organisme de normalisation des noms dans un pays qui
      n'en possède pas?

L'organisme canadien de normalisation des noms géographique a été crée en
1897. Après avoir été réorganisé plusieurs fois, il est devenu, en 1961, le
Comité permanent canadien des noms géographiques. Ce Comité comprend des
représentants des services du gouvernement fédéral s'occupant de nomenclature
ainsi qu'un représentant désigné par chacune des dix provinces.

      Les principaux critères à retenir en vue de créer un organisme de nor-
malisation des noms géographiques là où il n'en existe actuellement aucun,
sont *l'autorité, l'efficacité* et la *publicité*. Un tel organisme devrait être
revêtu par la loi de l'autorité nécessaire pour se prononcer sur la fixation
de tous les noms d'entités géographiques situées sur le territoire d'un pays

et tous les services gouvernementaux devraient être tenus de se conformer à ses décisions. Il doit y avoir liaison effective entre cet organisme et les services gouvernementaux chargés d'établir les cartes (terrestres ou marines, topographiques, hydrographiques ou spécialisées), de mettre en place les signaux routiers, d'exécuter les levés, d'élaborer des rapports scientifiques ou économiques comportant des noms géographiques, ainsi que les commissions de planification et les institutions s'occupant d'archives.

L'organe consutatif devrait être composé de représentants de tous les serivces s'occupant de cartographie et d'archives nationales ainsi que des autorités postales. Il serait également utile de leur adjoindre des spécialistes en matière de géographie et d'histoire choisis au sein du gouvernement ou en dehors. Ces membres devraient être désignés par la loi en leur qualité de directeurs des divers services gouvernementaux intéressés. Quant à la désignation des membres n'appartenant pas au gouvernement, elle devrait être faite avec soin, compte tenu de l'intérêt qu'ils portent à la question ou de leur compétence en la matière. On doit souligner qu'il s'agit davantage d'une charge exigeant de son titulaire un travail effectif qu'une charge honorifique. L'organisme s'occupant des noms géographiques devrait trancher toutes les questions relatives à des noms contestés et recommander à titre officiel, l'adoption de tous les nouveaux noms ou changements de nom. Les décisions à prendre devraient s'inspirer d'une série de règles en matière de nomenclature, dont l'élaboration constituerait la première tâche de l'organisme. A cet effet, celui-ci devrait étudier attentivement les différents règlements actuellement en vigueur dans les pays qui possèdent depuis longtemps un tel organisme tout en tenant compte des conditions et des problèmes propres à son pays.

Il est à prévoir que les membres de cet organisme auront d'autres responsabilités plus urgentes à remplir et il ne faut donc pas s'attendre à ce qu'ils consacrent beaucoup de leur temps à l'exécution des décisions, sans parler de la consignation des résultats de leurs travaux, dont il ne pourront pas se charger du tout. Il y aurait par conséquent intérêt à affecter à cet organisme un personnel dirigé par un secrétaire compétent, chargé de surveiller le travail quotidien de mise au point des, noms de consigner les résultats des travaux et qui pourrait, avec un peu d'expérience, prendre au nom de l'organisme des décisions en matière de noms courants non contestés.

Il serait préférable que le ministre du gouvernement de qui relève l'organisme en question ne soit pas tenu d'approuver personnellement toutes les décisions en matière de noms et qu'il délègue ces attributions au président de l'organisme ou au secrétaire tout en se réservant le droit de se prononcer définitivement sur tout nom susceptible de donner lieu à une controverse publique ou de constituer une cause possible d'embarras pour le gouvernement. Il faut signaler aussi que, si l'on fait figurer dans la législation une disposition selon laquelle toute décision en matière de noms ne devient définitive qu'une fois publiée dans la presse ou au journal officiel, il peut en résulter des retards inutiles.

Il faut faire en sorte que les décisions en matière de noms reçoivent la plus large publicité de façon qu'ils soient admis et employés dans tout le pays. On y parvient dans une certaine mesure en faisant paraître ces décisions au journal officiel mais il faut aussi faire suivre ou accompagner cette parution de l'élaboration et de la publication d'une nomenclature

nationale, qui devra être mise à jour de temps à autre, au fur et à mesure des besoins. Cette nomenclature devra identifier chaque entité par un nom, lui appliquer le terme générique approprié et la localiser par le moyen de coordonnées géographiques. Il peut y avoir intérêt à publier, à des intervalles réguliers ou irréguliers, les décisions prises entre deux révisions de la nomenclature nationale.

C

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE OF NATIONAL NAMES AUTHORITIES *

Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names

The national names authority in Canada, the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names, was established by federal statute in 1961 and is descended from the Geographic Board of Canada, created in 1897.

The Permanent Committee is composed of persons appointed by virtue of their positions in the federal and provincial governments of Canada. As a corporate body, it is responsible to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources of Canada, whose ministry provides the positions and accommodation for the secretariat as well as funds required for the publication of the *Gazetteer of Canada*. The federal representatives on the Committee include:

Chairman: the Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of
                  Energy, Mines and Resources;

Vice-Chairman: the Director, Geographical Branch;**

Members: the Director, Surveys and Mapping Branch;
                  the Dominion Archivist;
                  the Director of Operational Services and Survey,
                  Department of National Defence:
                  the Superintendent, Bureau for Translations,
                  Department of Secretary of State;
                  and a representative for the Yukon and
                  Northwest Territories.

Each province is represented by a member appointed by the appropriate provincial Minister. The provinces of Quebec, Alberta and Newfoundland

---

*Prepared by J.K. Fraser.

** The functions of the Geographical Branch will be redistributed among other branches of the Department as of April, 1968.

have established provincial names boards and their secretaries act as the representatives on the Permanent Committee. Most of the members deal directly or indirectly with name problems, mainly in map nomenclature, and thus have a close and continuous interest in the standardization of geographical names. The Dominion Archivist and the Superintendent, Bureau for Translations, act mainly in advisory capacities on matters pertaining to their specializations.

The Permanent Committee meets in plenary session once a year in one of the provincial capitals or in Ottawa, when general matters of policy are discussed and reports presented on the progress of names standardization. In case of matters requiring immediate decision, provision is made to call a meeting of Ottawa members of the Committee.

The secretariat of the Permanent Committee was, until this year, administered by the Geographical Branch as the Toponymy Division. It is intended to move it under the directorate of the Surveys and Mapping Branch in March 1968, with the same functions and responsibilities as before. The Executive Secretary of the Committee is the Chief, Toponymy Division, which is divided into four sections: Research, Gazetteers, English Nomenclature and French Nomenclature. The secretariat is responsible for the verification and investigation of the nomenclature on all new or revised topographic maps and hydrographic charts produced by the federal mapping agencies, regional studies aimed at clarifying the local nomenclature of areas in serious need of standardization, the answering of inquiries on Canadian names, the maintenance of name records, the distribution of name decisions and the preparation and publication of the *Gazetteer of Canada*. The bilingual nature of Canadian toponymy demands that the secretariat include personnel who are fluent in French and English.

Under the federal system of government in Canada, it is recognized that each province has authority over geographical names in the territory falling under its jurisdiction. New names or name changes are approved by the Permanent Committee only after firm recommendations are received from the respective provinces. Names in the Yukon and Northwest Territories are approved by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources following endorsement by the territorial representative. Agreement is sought between the provinces and the National Parks Branch concerning names of features in national parks, almost all of which lie within provincial boundaries. Similar arrangements exist concerning names in Indian Reserves, which, like the parks, come under federal administration.

Name decisions are processed by the secretariat and circulated to mapping agencies, postal authorities and others concerned with the publication of material requiring up-to-date information on geographical names. New names, name changes, altered applications and rescissions are published according to province or territory in semi-annual *Supplements* to the *Gazetteer of Canada*.

Close liaison is maintained with the Post Office Department and with railway companies, all of which seek the advice of the Permanent Committee on matters pertaining to geographical names, in particular the opening of new post offices or railway stations. The advice of specialists in Amerindian languages is readily available through the National Museum or the

Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

It is considered preferable that the position of Executive Secretary be filled by a graduate in geography with specialization or interest in historical geography. It is an added advantage for him to be fluently bilingual in English and French and also to have additional training in linguistics. He is allowed considerable authority in conducting liaison with provincial authorities and in approving names on behalf of the Committee. Matters which might create public controversy or which should have ministerial approval are brought to the attention of the Chairman at the discretion of the Executive Secretary.

C

STRUCTURE ADMINISTRATIVE DES ORGANISMES NATIONAUX
COMPETENTS EN MATIERE DE TOPONYMIE*

Comité permanent canadien des noms géographiques

Le Comité permanent canadien des noms géographiques est l'autorité compétente
en matière de toponymie au Canada. Ce comité a été crée par statut fédéral
en 1961 et a succédé à la Commission géographique du Canada qui avait été
établie en 1897.

Les membres du Comité permanent sont choisis en raison de leurs postes
auprès des gouvernements fédéral et provinciaux du Canada. Comme tel, ce
comité est sous l'autorité du ministre de l'Energie, des Mines et des
Ressources, dont le ministère fournit le personnel et les locaux nécessaires
au secrétariat de même que les fonds requis pour son administration et la
publication du *Répertoire des noms géographiques du Canada*. Les représentants
du gouvernement fédéral sont:

Président: le Sous-ministre adjoint du ministère de l'Energie,
                     des Mines et des Ressources;

Vice-président: le Directeur de la Direction de la géographie;**

Membres: le Directeur de la Direction des levés et de la
                     cartographie;

                     l'Archiviste du Canada;

                     le Directeur des services opérationnels et des levés
                     du ministère de la Défense nationale;

                     le Surintendant du Bureau des traductions, Secrétariat
                     d'Etat.

Les territoires fédéraux du Yukon et du Nord-Ouest sont aussi représentés.

---

*Présenté par J.K. Fraser.

**Les responsibilités de la Direction de la géographie seront réparties
parmi les autres directions du ministère en avril, 1968.

Chaque province est représentée par un membre nommé par le ministre de
la province concernée. Les provinces de Québec, de l'Alberta et de Terre-
Neuve ont aussi institué leurs propres commissions provinciales sur les
toponymes, et les secrétaires de ces commissions siègent au Comité permanent.
La plupart des membres sont directement ou indirectement concernés avec les
problèmes de noms géographiques, principalement en ce qui a trait à la nomen-
clature cartographique. Ils ont donc un très grand intérêt dans la nomen-
clature des noms géographiques. L'Archiviste du Canada et le Surintendant du
Bureau des traductions agissent surtout comme conseillers pour les problèmes
concernant leurs disciplines respectives.

Au cours de son assemblée plénière qui se tient une fois par année dans
l'une des capitales provinciales ou à Ottawa, le Comité permanent traite de
questions d'ordre général et divers rapports sont présentés sur les progrès
réalisés dans la normalisation des noms géographiques. Dans le cas de
problèmes qui demandent une décision plus immédiate, les membres du comité
qui résident à Ottawa sont convoqués périodiquement.

La Division de la toponymie de la Direction de la géographie a administré
jusqu'à cette année le secrétariat du Comité permanent. On a cependant l'in-
tention de l'incorporer à la Direction des levés et de la cartographie en
mars 1968,   en lui conservant toutefois les mêmes fonctions et responsa-
bilités qu'auparavant. Le Secrétaire exécutif du comité est le chef de la
Division de la toponymie, qui comprend quatre sections: la recherche, les
répertoires, la nomenclature anglaise et la nomenclature française.

Le Secrétaire exécutif est chargé de la vérification et des enquêtes
sur les noms qui figurent sur toutes les cartes topographiques et hydro-
graphiques revisées ou nouvelles que produisent les organismes cartographi-
ques du gouvernement fédéral, des études régionales sur les noms particuliers
de certaines régions où se fait sentir un besoin urgent de normalisation. Il
doit en plus répondre aux demandes de renseignements sur les noms canadiens,
maintenir des archives sur les noms, faire connaître les décisions rendues
en matière de toponymie, rédiger et publier le *Répertoire des noms géographi-
ques du Canada*. La nature bilingue de la toponymie au Canada exige qu'une
partie du personnel du secrétariat connaisse bien le français et l'anglais.

Le système du gouvernement fédéral au Canada reconnaît que chaque pro-
vince a un droit de regard sur les noms géographiques dans le territoire
sous sa juridiction. Il s'ensuit que le Comité permanent n'approuve les
noms nouveaux ou les changements de noms qu'après avoir reçu des recommanda-
tions appropriées des provinces respectives. Les noms de lieux dans le
Yukon et les Territoires du Nord-Ouest sont approuvés par le ministère de
l'Energie, des Mines et des Ressources après avoir reçu l'approbation du re-
présentant de ces territoires. En ce qui a trait aux noms dans les parcs
nationaux dont la plupart sont situés en territoire provincial, des accords
sont d'abord obtenus du représentant de la province concernée. Il existe
des ententes semblables pour les noms dans les réserves indiennes qui, comme
dans le cas des parcs nationaux, relèvent de l'administration fédérale.

Le secrétariat du Comité permanent donne suite aux décisions prises sur
les noms et transmet ces dernières aux agences de cartes géographiques, aux
autorités postales et autres agences qui s'occupent de la publication de
documents qui nécessitent des renseignements à jour sur les noms géographiques.

On publie, selon la province ou le territoire, des *Suppléments* semestriels au *Répertoire des noms géographiques du Canada*. Ces suppléments contiennent les nouveaux noms, les changements de noms, les applications modifiées et les retraits de certains noms.

Le comité demeure en contact avec les représentants du ministère des Postes et des sociétés ferroviaires qui recherchent ses conseils sur les noms géographiques, particulièrement lors de l'ouverture de nouveaux bureaux de poste ou de nouvelles gares de chemin de fer. Les spécialistes dans les langues amérindiennes sont accessibles par l'entremise du Musée national ou du ministère des Affaires Indiennes et du Nord Canadien.

On juge qu'il est préférable que le poste de Secrétaire exécutif soit confié à un diplômé en géographie ayant une spécialité ou un intérêt particulier dans la géographie historique. Il est aussi avantageux que cette personne possède des connaissances suffisantes des langues française et anglaise et qu'il ait une formation supérieure en linguistique. Le secrétaire jouit d'une grande latitude dans ses rapports avec les autorités provinciales et a le pouvoir d'approuver des noms géographiques au nom du comité. Le Secrétaire exécutif peut, à sa discrétion, porter à l'attention du Président des sujets qui pourraient causer une controverse ou qui doivent recevoir l'approbation finale du ministre.

D

G A Z E T T E E R   O F   C A N A D A *

Introduction

Between 1898 and 1927, the Geographic Board of Canada, the original national
names authority created in 1897, published lists of its decisions on select-
ed groups of contentious geographical names, but any that did not require
special consideration were not included. These lists were published as
supplements to departmental annual reports or in the *Canada Gazette* and
were not generally available to the public or easily used for reference
purposes. It was decided in 1950 that a gazetteer including all names
would be more useful and acceptable and would be welcomed both for official
use and by the general public. Owing to the magnitude of the task, it was
decided that the origin and meaning of the names and other items of histori-
cal interest could not be included.

The concept of producing a series of regional gazetteers of approxi-
mately the same size was originally considered and Southwestern Ontario was
selected for the first volume, appearing in 1952. Reconsideration resulted
in a decision to publish the series according to province or territory, as
it was evident that although some volumes would be grossly larger than others,
the convenience of compilation in collaboration with the respective provin-
cial offices as well as the convenience to the user would be preferable to
attempting any artificial uniformity in size.

Accordingly, subsequent volumes were produced for *British Columbia*
(1953), *Manitoba* (1955), *New Brunswick* (1956), *Saskatchewan* (1957), *Alberta*
(1958), *Yukon and Northwest Territories* (1958), *Prince Edward Island* (1960),
Nova Scotia (1961) and *Ontario* (1962). The volume for *Newfoundland and
Labrador* is expected to appear in 1968. Work has been underway for two years
on the *Gazetteer of Quebec* in close collaboration with the provincial board
and it is expected to be published in 1969.

It was hoped that a ten-year revision period could be established, but
shortage of personnel and delays in printing forced the first revision,

_____

*Prepared by J.K. Fraser and R. Disipio.

that of the *Gazetteer of British Columbia*, to be deferred until 1967. The *Gazetteer of Manitoba* is currently being revised.

The volumes produced range in size from Ontario with over 44,000 names and 614 pages, British Columbia (2nd ed.) with 35,000 names and 739 pages to Prince Edward Island with less than 1,350 names and 19 pages. The discrepancy in the British Columbia gazetteer results from a different system of location of the feature which often involves more than one line of type.

(i) *Alphabetization:*

The set of rules for alphabetization used by the United States Board on Geographic Names was adopted in 1950 subject to changes dictated by experience. At present, the general rules of alphabetization used for the *Gazetteer of Canada* are as follows:

1) The specific term or proper name is the basis for alphabetization, with the generic term being taken into account in the listing of two or more identical proper names.

2) The name of a populated place which is identical to that of a natural feature is given preference in the listing.

3) Generic terms that precede specific terms are listed following, separated by a comma.

Examples
Monte Bluff	*Point*
Monte, Cape	*Cape*
Monte Creek	*Post Office*
Monte Creek	*Creek*
Monte Hills	*Hills*
Monte Lake	*Settlement*
Monte Lake	*Lake*
Monte, Mount	*Mountain*

4) Neither an article nor a generic term is used in the initial alphabetization unless it is part of a personal name, part of the name of a populated place or used with a name with a French specific and an English generic.

Examples
Knoll, The	*Hill*
La Biche River	*River*
Lac la Hache	*Post Office*
La Forme Creek	*Creek*
La Garde Creek	*Creek*
La Plante Sunker	*Rock*
L.H. Creek	*Creek*
The Knoll	*Settlement*

5) Rules of French alphabetization are similar, with a few exceptions concerning the use of the article.

Baie-d'Urfe	Post Office
Carillon, Rapide de	Rapids
Cheval-Blanc, Rapid de	Rapids
D'Aloigny, Ile	Island
d'en Bas, Petit chenal	Channel
d'en Haut, Chenal	Channel
Deux-Montagnes, Lac des	Lake
Grande Anse	Cove
Grande Baie, La	Bay
La Conception	Post Office
La Petite-Rivière	Station
L'Assomption	Village
Les Cèdres	Post Office
L'Islet	Town
Lorette, Rivière	River
Louis, Mont	Mountain
Mont-Royal	Station
Moulin-a-Vent, Pointe de	Point
Oka, Pointe d'	Point
Oka-sur-le-lac	Town
Orme, Ruisseau à l'	Creek
Pointe-Fortune	Village
Rivière-Rouge	Town
Ronde, Ile	Island
Rouge, Rivière	River

6) A descriptive adjective preceding a French name is not used in alphabetization.

Examples

Baleine, Petite Rivière à la	River
Bleus, Les petit lacs	Lakes
Epaule, Grand lac à l'	Lake
Poisson-blanc, Petit lac	Lake

7) Similar names identifying the same kind of feature are listed according to latitude.

Examples

Brown Lake ...	$49^{o}15' - 106^{o}22'$
Brown Lake ...	$50^{o}27' - 101^{o}12'$
Brown Lake ...	$56^{o}10' - 102^{o}30'$

8) Names beginning with *Mac* or *Mc* are alphabetized consistently throughout.

9) Names beginning with *Saint*, *St.* or *Ste.* are alphabetized consistently and in this order.

In general, the rules of alphabetization are adhered to consistently so as to allow the least chance of confusion to the user of the gazetteer, bearing in mind that the normal user looks up a name by referring to that term which identifies rather than describes it. Thus the user turns to *Belle Isle, Strait of* rather than to the form *Strait of Belle Isle*

(ii) *Cross referencing:*

One of the considerations in the preparation of the *Gazetteer of Canada* was
that it should contain not only officially approved names in current use
but also former names and unofficial names of features and settlements.
Thus the user may look up a feature known to him as *Mud Creek* and find the
gazetteer refers him to another name by which the creek is officially re-
cognized. Name changes are published in the semi-annual Supplements and
incorporated in subsequent revisions of the gazetteers.

An asterisk after the name of a populated place indicates that the
settlement no longer exists. Normally such names are rescinded and de-
leted from the topographic maps, but in the sparsely settled northern
parts of Canada, the name is usually retained, qualified by *abandoned* or
unoccupied.

(iii) *Indication of type of feature:*

1) Classification of populated places:

Although titles such as city, town and village are reasonably consistent
across Canada in designating incorporated settlements, the designations for
unincorporated places vary from province to province. The term *hamlet* is
used in some provinces but not in others. *Settlement* indicates a community
less compact than a hamlet, while *locality* is used for a cross roads, for an
abandoned settlement or for a community where the population is scattered.
Census data, municipal records and examination of large scale maps and air
photos are used in determining the appropriate designation in the hierarchy
of populated places. This descriptive terminology is listed in the Feature
column following the name of the populated place:

Examples		
	Cobble Hill	*Post Office*
	Hunts Inlet	*Settlement*
	Jackpine	*Locality*
	Lobbville	*Station*
	Mono Hills	*Hamlet*
	Ottawa	*City*
	Sifton	*Village*

2) Generic terms:

Numerous generic terms used in Canadian toponymy are unfamiliar to the
general public and require clarification in the gazetteer. This information
is provided in the Feature column in which the common descriptive term in-
dicates the nature of features such as *pup* (creek), *tolt* (hill), *tickle*
(passage), *pingo* (hill), *spot* (bank or shoal), etc.

(iv) *Locational information:*

The system of land division and its terminology is not uniform across Canada
but differs according to the historical development of the nation and the
characteristics of the terrain. A county system is used in most of eastern
Canada, with subdivision usually into townships or parishes, with parts of
northern Quebec and Ontario administered as districts. The Prairie Provinces

40

utilize the cadastral subdivision of section, township and range. In British Columbia, administrative districts take the place of the eastern county system.

The Location column provides generalized information so that the user may easily determine the general location of a populated place or natural feature. Each populated place is located according to the administrative districts or with reference to a larger, well-known settlement. Natural features are located with reference to other more significant named features, many of which are shown on the key map in the gazetteer. The Location column in the British Columbia gazetteer provides more detailed information than those of the other provinces because the quadrilateral indexing system used does not provide the precision of geographical co-ordinates.

The Position column lists the geographical co-ordinates (except in British Columbia). Latitude and longitude to the nearest minute is determined from the latest available large-scale maps or charts and indicates the positions of the mouths of streams and the centres of lakes, bays, peninsulas or islands.

(v)   *Explanatory and additional information:*

Each gazetteer includes prefatory material explaining the policy or procedure governing classification of populated places, cross references, alphabetization and the manner in which locational information has been determined. A list of abbreviations is also included. A section on the history and development of the province accompanies the British Columbia gazetteer, as well as tables listing geographic data on the main rivers, islands and lakes, and the names of incorporated municipalities. A section on climate in the first edition of this gazetteer was omitted in the second edition.

The *Gazetteer of Newfoundland and Labrador* will include a separate section on the names of the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon. While recognizing that Canada has no jurisdiction over the geographical nomenclature of these French possessions, it was considered that due to the proximity of the islands to Canada, the listing of these names, taken from French topographical maps and checked with authorities in Paris, would be of interest and usefulness to users of the gazetteer.

(vi) *Editing procedure:*

The compilation of each of the *Gazetteer of Canada* series is essentially a review of the approved geographical nomenclature of the province in question. This information is maintained in an alphabetical card file which provides the correct form of the name, the feature designation, location, position, date of approval, map or chart index, and origin or meaning, if known. The information to be published is checked for accuracy to ensure that it incorporates any recent changes, discrepancies are cleared with the provincial office, and the list printed on Photo-list cards. After rechecking, these cards are used to prepare the proofs which are again edited by the gazetteer

staff. The sale price and run are determined in consultation with the government printing office.

The collaboration of the provincial representatives on the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names is an essential part of the compilation of the respective gazetteers. While the secretariat is responsible for the basic compilation, printing arrangements, costs and general format, close liaison is maintained with the province concerning designations of features and prefatory material.

Copies of most of the *Gazetteer of Canada* series may be obtained from the Queen's Printer, Ottawa, Canada (Examples were available for examination during the conference).

Sample page, *Supplement, Gazetteer of Canada*

SASKATCHEWAN

NAME	FEATURE	LOCATION	POSITION

Name Changes

Blumenthal	Hamlet	NE. of Saskatoon	33-40-3-W3	52 29 106 22
NOT Blumentahe (hamlet)				
Bonville Lake	Lake	Upper Foster L.		56 40 105 34
NOT Bonville Bay				
Goldenvale	Settlement	NW. of Yorkton	10-30-7-W2	51 35 102 54
NOT Golden Vale (settlement)				
Greenfeld	Hamlet	NE. of Saskatoon	15-40-5-W3	52 29 106 22
NOT Gruenfeldt (hamlet)				
Rheinland	Hamlet	NE. of Saskatoon	31-39-4-W3	52 25 106 30
NOT Rineland (hamlet)				
St-Denis	Post Office	E. of Saskatoon	4-37-1-W3	52 09 106 07
NOT St. Denis (Post Office)				

Altered Applications

Battle Creek	Post Office	SW. of Cypress L.	33-5-29-W3	49 26 109 51
			NOT 4-6-29-W3	49 26 109 48
Beaver Dale	Post Office	NW. of Yorkton	15-26-7-W2	51 15 102 54
			NOT 34-26-7-W2	51 18 102 53
Lonepine Creek	Creek	Flows SE. into		
		Belanger Cr.	7-7-25-W3	49 33 109 23
			NOT 13-7-26-W3	49 36 109 24
Merryflat	Post Office	W. of Cypress L.	14-6-29-W3	49 28 109 48
			NOT 23-6-29-W3	49 27 109 45

Rescinded

Arena	Locality	SE. of Cypress L.	10-2-25-W3	49 08 109 16
Bedfordville	Locality	NW. of Yorkton	13-27-11-W2	51 20 103 27
Brombury	Hamlet	NW. of Yorkton	24-28-11-W2	51 26 103 34
Dracup	Locality	W. of Yorkton	5-26-4-W2	51 13 102 32
(Pollack	Station	N. of Yorkton	13-27-4-W2	51 19 102 24
(Pollock				
Tullymet	Locality	N. of Balcarres	26-23-12-W2	51 01 103 36
Windsor Lake	Locality	NE. of Redberry L.	20-45-7-W3	52 54 107 00
Young Siding	Station	N. of Yorkton	24-26-4-W2	51 16 102 27

NAME	FEATURE	LOCATION	POSITION
			° ' ° '
Council Lake	Lake	Wilson Tp., Parry Sound Dist.	45 51 80 02
Countess Lake	Lake	Hyndman Tp., Kenora Dist.	49 33 92 01
Counts Bank	Bank	Key Hr., Parry Sound Dist.	44 53 80 48
Couple Lake	Lake	Fox Tp., Cochrane Dist.	49 02 80 48
Course Lake	Lake	N. of Pickerel L., Rainy River Dist.	48 59 91 28
Coursol Bay	Bay	Whalesback Chan., Algoma Dist.	46 11 82 28
Court Lake	Lake	NW. of Barbara L., Thunder Bay Dist.	49 27 87 58
Courtice	Settlement	Darlington Tp., Durham Co.	43 55 78 46
Courtis Lake	Lake	NW. of North Caribou L., Kenora Dist., P.P.	53 07 91 08
Courtland	Village	Middleton Tp., Norfolk Co.	42 51 80 38
Courtney Bank	Bank	North Chan., Manitoulin Dist.	46 01 82 19
Courtney Island	Island	North Chan., Manitoulin Dist.	46 01 82 18
Courtney Lake	Lake	Brown Tp., Parry Sound Dist.	45 51 80 17
Courtright	Village (Inc.)	Moore Tp., Lambton Co.	42 49 82 28
Courtright Ridge	Ridge	South Walsingham Tp., Norfolk Co.	42 34 80 16
Cousin Island	Island	Georgian B., Parry Sound Dist.	45 20 80 11
Cousins, The	Islands	North Chan., Algoma Dist.	46 05 82 49
Coutch Lake	Lake	N. of Lake St. Joseph, Kenora Dist., P.P.	51 36 90 45
Coutlee Island	Island	Lake Superior, Thunder Bay Dist.	48 32 88 19
Couttsville	Settlement	Hilliard Tp., Timiskaming Dist.	47 40 79 41
Couture Lake	Lake	E. of Sturgeon L., Thunder Bay Dist.	50 08 90 39
Couture Lake	Lake	SW. of North Caribou L., Kenora Dist., P.P.	52 30 91 48
Cove, The	Lake	Thames R., Middlesex Co.	42 58 81 16
Cove Inlet	Station	SE. of Lake Nipigon, Thunder Bay Dist.	49 21 88 08
Cove Island	Island	North B., Muskoka Dist.	45 03 79 35
Cove Island	Island	Georgian B., Bruce Co.	45 17 81 44
Cove Island Ground	Shoal Bank	Georgian B., Bruce Co.	45 19 81 45
Cove Island Harbour	Harbour	Georgian B., Bruce Co.	45 18 81 43
Coveney Island	Island	Sturgeon L., Thunder Bay Dist.	50 01 90 42
Coveney Lake	Lake	E. of Sturgeon L., Thunder Bay Dist.	50 03 90 36
Coventry	Settlement	Albion Tp., Peel Co.	43 54 79 44
Coveo Lake	Lake	Bronson Tp., Nipissing Dist.	46 02 77 46
Cove Of Cork Bay	Bay	Georgian B., Bruce Co.	44 57 81 00
Cover Lake	Lake	N. of Lac Seul, Kenora Dist., P.P.	50 31 92 17
Coverdale	Settlement	Hamilton Tp., Northumberland Co.	43 58 78 09
Covey Lake	Lake	N. of Wababimiga L., Cochrane Dist.	50 46 86 25
Covill Island	Island	Lower Rideau L., Leeds Co.	44 52 76 06
Coville Lake	Lake	SW. of Lake Nipigon, Thunder Bay Dist.	49 01 89 16
Cow Island	Island	Bay of Quinte, Prince Edward Co.	44 08 77 22
Cow Island	Island	Rice L., Northumberland Co.	44 09 78 15
Cow Island	Island	Opinicon L., Leeds Co.	44 34 76 19
Cow Island	Island	Rideau L., Leeds Co.	44 43 76 12
Cow Island	Island	Eels L., Peterborough Co.	44 53 78 09
Cow Island	Island	Georgian B., Parry Sound Dist.	45 12 80 05
Cow Island	Island	Bay of Islands, Manitoulin Dist.	46 05 81 50
Cow Lake	Lake	Sherborne Tp., Haliburton Co.	45 14 78 48
Cow Lake	Lake	Tp. 11 F, Sudbury Dist.	47 31 83 29
Cow Lake	Lake	Midlothian Tp., Timiskaming Dist.	47 53 80 57
Cow River	River	24-XVI, Algoma Dist.	47 23 83 59
Cowal	Hamlet	Dunwich Tp., Elgin Co.	42 44 81 29
Cowamula Lake	Lake	Colenso & Mutrie Tps., Kenora Dist.	49 53 93 20
Cowan Bay	Bay	Bark L., Hastings Co.	45 24 77 49
Cowan Creek	Creek	Flows S. into Southern L., Thunder Bay Dist.	49 19 87 22
Cowan Creek	Creek	Flows N. into Chisamore L., Thunder Bay Dist.	49 20 89 44
Cowan Lake	Lake	Watt Tp., Muskoka Dist.	45 09 79 29
Cowan Lake		See Central Lake	49 09 87 51
Cowan Lake	Lake	SW. of Lake Nipigon, Thunder Bay Dist.	49 14 89 42
Cowan Lake	Lake	W. of Long L., Thunder Bay Dist.	49 20 87 23
Cowie Bay	Bay	Black B., Thunder Bay Dist.	48 27 88 34
Cowie Creek	Creek	23-XIII, Algoma Dist.	47 04 83 51
Cowie Lake	Lake	22-XII, Algoma Dist.	47 03 83 50
Cowie Point	Point	W. shore Black B., Thunder Bay Dist.	48 27 88 35
Cowie Reef	Reef	Georgian B., Parry Sound Dist.	45 05 80 08
Cowles Lake	Lake	W. of Dog L., Thunder Bay Dist.	48 43 89 59
Cowman Lake	Lake	NW. of Lake Nipigon, Thunder Bay Dist.	50 32 89 08
Cowper	Township	Parry Sound Dist.	45 15 80 05
Cowper Bay	Bay	Georgian B., Parry Sound Dist.	45 13 80 06
Cowper Lake	Lake	Cowper Tp., Parry Sound Dist.	45 15 80 03
Cox	Township	Sudbury Dist.	46 09 80 45

Sample page, *Gazetteer of British Columbia*

NAME	FEATURE	LOCATION	POSITION
Hunt Point	Point	On N. coast of Porcher I., Rge. 5, Coast Dist.	54 130 SE.
Hunt Rock	Rock	E. side of Nigei I., Gordon Chan., Rupert Dist.	50 127 NW.
Hunter Channel	Channel	Between Hunter and Campbell Is., Rge. 3, Coast Dist.	52 128 SE.
Hunter Creek	Creek	Flows SE. into Susap Cr., Similkameen Dist.	49 119 SW.
Hunter Creek	Creek	Flows N. into Fraser R., W. of Hope, Yale Dist.	49 121 SW.
Hunter Creek	Creek	Flows E. and S. into Kuskanax Cr., Kootenay Dist.	50 117 SE.
Hunter Creek	Creek	Flows SW. into Kitimat R., SE. of Lakelse L., Rge. 5, Coast Dist.	54 128 SE.
Hunter Island	Island	N. of Calvert I., Rge. 2, Coast Dist.	51 128 NE.
Hunter Lake	Lake	S. of Sandy L., N. of jct. of Matthew and Cariboo Rs., Cariboo Dist.	53 121 SE.
Hunter Lakes	Lakes	Hdwtrs. of Pickell Cr., Peace River Dist.	57 121 SE.
Hunter, Mount	Mountain	NW. of jct. of Porcupine Cr. and Kicking Horse R., Kootenay Dist.	51 116 SW.
Hunter, Mount	Mountain	SE. of Azouzetta L., Peace River Dist.	55 122 SE.
Hunter Peak		See Hunter, Mount	55 122 SE.
Hunter Point	Point	E. side of Ladysmith Hr., Oyster Dist.	48 123 NW.
Hunter Point	Point	N. entrance point of Cartwright Sd., Q.C. Dist.	53 132 SW.
Huntergroup Creek	Creek	Flows S. into Dease R., E. of Pooley Cr., Cassiar Dist.	59 129 SE.
Hunters Creek	Creek	Flows SE. into Santa Rosa Cr., E. of Cascade, Similkameen Dist.	49 118 SE.
Hunters Lake	Lake	S. of jct. of Canyon Cr. and Dease R., Cassiar Dist.	58 130 NE.
Hunters Range	Range	NW. of N. end of Mabel L., Kamloops Dist.	50 118 NW.
Hunters Camp Point	Point	E. side North Arm, Quesnel L., Cariboo Dist.	52 120 NW.
Huntingdon	Post Office	On C.P.R., S. of Abbotsford, New Westminster Dist.	49 122 SE.
Huntingdon, Mount	Mountain	SE. of mouth of Stagoo Cr., Cassiar Dist.	55 129 SW.
Huntingford Point	Point	S. side of Menzies Bay, E. of Bloedel, Sayward Dist.	50 125 SE.
Huntley Creek		See Hutley Creek	50 119 SE.
Huntley, Mount	Mountain	Between Hobson and Azure Ls., Kamloops Dist.	52 120 SE.
Huntley, Mount		See Puntzi Ridge	52 124 SE.
Huntly Island	Island	Fraser L., near W. end, Rge. 5, Coast Dist.	54 124 SW.
Hunts Creek	Creek	Flows E. into Qualicum R., N. of Horne L., Alberni Dist.	49 124 SW.
Hunts Inlet	Settlement	N. coast of Porcher I., Rge. 5, Coast Dist.	54 130 SE.
Hupel	Settlement	N. side of Shuswap R., W. of outlet from Mabel L., Kamloops Dist.	50 118 NW.
Hurd, Mount	Mountain	SE. of jct. of Ottertail and Kicking Horse Rs., Kootenay Dist.	51 116 SW.
Hurd Pass	Pass	SE. of jct. of Ottertail and Kicking Horse Rs., Kootenay Dist.	51 116 SW.
Hurley River	River	Flows NE. and N. into Bridge R., E. of Gun L., Lillooet Dist.	50 122 NW.
Huron Island	Island	One of Tribal Gp., W. of S. end of Campbell I., Rge. 3, Coast Dist.	52 128 SE.
Hurricane Creek	Creek	Flows S. into Nakina R., E. of Llangorse L., Cassiar Dist.	59 132 SW.
Hurricane Island	Island	SW. end of Hunter I., E. of Spider I., Rge. 2, Coast Dist.	51 128 NE.
Hurricane Point	Point	S. side of E. end of Quesnel L., Cariboo Dist.	52 120 NW.
Hurst Creek	Creek	Flows E. toward Frances Cr., W. of Columbia R., Kootenay Dist.	50 116 NE.
Hurst Island	Island	E. of Balaklava I., between Gordon and Goletas Chans., Rupert Dist.	50 127 NW.
Hurtado Point	Point	S. of Lund, NE. of Savary I., New Westminster Dist.	49 124 NW.
Hurtubise Creek	Creek	Flows N. into George Cr., SW. of Ispah L., Cariboo Dist.	53 122 NE.
Huscroft	Locality	E. of Kootenay R., near Int. Bdy., Kootenay Dist.	49 116 SE.
Huscroft Creek	Creek	Flows NW. into Rykert Cr., E. of Columbia R., Kootenay Dist.	49 116 SE.
Huscroft, Mount	Mountain	Between Corn and Boundary Crs., Kootenay Dist.	49 116 SW.
Husdon Creek	Creek	Flows S. into Wilson Cr., E. of Wilson Creek P.O., New Westminster Dist.	49 123 SW.

E

PROGRESS MADE IN THE STANDARDIZATION OF GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES – PROVINCE OF ALBERTA *

Geographic Board of Alberta

Alberta is the most westerly of the three Canadian Prairie Provinces and the second most westerly province in Canada itself. It entered recorded history comparatively late - in 1754 when the first European explorer, Anthony Henday crossed the vast prairie hinterland and sighted the Rocky Mountains from the foothills. Alberta only became a province in 1905, which is in living memory of many people. In those sixty-two years it has progressed from a predominately rural area to one which is becoming more urban and diversified thanks to the discoveries of oil within the past two decades.

Even if Alberta was a latecomer to the historical scene, it came bearing a rich heritage of place-names. The names of Alberta are derived mainly from three sources; *Amerindian, French,* and *Anglo-Saxon.* Other groups have added to these names over the years, but the first three are the principal ones. The period covered is from the era of the fur-trader and later the missionaries and the time of settlement and railway building, which in its turn extended from the early nineteen hundreds to the present day. As examples, there are such names as the *Saskatchewan* (both the North and South Saskatchewan Rivers flow through Alberta) meaning swift current and derived from the Cree Indian "Kis-is-ska-tche-wan". There is *Lake Wabamun* from the Indian name for mirror. *Wesaskiwin,* another city in the province, derives its name from hill of peace. *Athabasca* means where there are reeds. The list is almost endless and these names are in current use today even if they have been anglicized to some extent. The coming of fur trade brought both French and Anglo-Saxon influences. Many French traders worked with the Northwest Company and Hudson's Bay Company and left their mark upon Alberta, although most French names extend from the active missionary period where the Oblate Fathers were prominent. *Lacombe* is named after Father Albert Lacombe, O.M.I., a famous early missionary in Alberta. *Lac Ste Anne, Lac Des Arcs, Lac La Nonn* all date from this period in names. *Isle Lake,* a rather poor adoption of a descriptive name, appears on old maps as Lac Desisles and no one knows why this was not retained.

---

*Prepared by E.J. Holmgren

The Anglo-Saxon influence was greatest apart from the Indian, for Alberta became ultimately to be settled both in fur trade times and later by people of predominantly British extraction. The name *Alberta* itself is after Princess Louise Caroline Alberta, fourth daughter of Queen Victoria and wife of Marquis of Lorne, who was Governor-General of Canada from 1878 to 1883. This gifted man wrote a sonnet dedicated to his wife in which he gave the name to the province. *Edmonton* is after Edmonton, Middlesex, England (now a suburb of London) and was named by a Hudson's Bay trader, William Tomison, as a compliment to his chief clerk John Peter Pruden who hailed from Edmonton, England. The list is endless and would demand a paper in itself to do it justice.

The representation of Alberta on the *national names authority* was originally limited to one member who was on the early Geographic Board of Canada and who did what and when he could to keep the central board in Ottawa informed. During this formative period many names came into use - in many instances names that would better have been forgotten but which came into being through common usage. At first, there seems to have been no definite rules. This state of affairs however, informal though seemingly effective, continued until the close of World War II.

It was in 1947 following one or two unfortunate instances that the *Geographic Board of Alberta* came into being. It had been felt that the naming of features was too haphazard and the one person acting as the agent was likely to be subject to pressures from groups and individuals anxious to perpetuate memories of events and people unworthy of such honours. The board early established liaison with the central board at Ottawa and in 1949, the *Geographical Names Act* was passed setting out the duties and responsibilities for the correlating, collection and ruling on new names and controversial names already in existance. The legislative librarian acts as secretary to the board and Alberta member for the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names; three other members are appointed by order-in-council, while the fourth, the director of surveys, is, like the legislative librarian, a statutory member.

Since its formation the board has been responsible for not only new names of geographical features but for the checking of existing names. This involves not only the correct spelling but the correct use and application of these names. In carrying out this work, it aims to cooperate with other levels of government - federal, provincial and municipal - as well as all organizations and individuals concerned with geographic features. Examples of some of these are government departments, railway companies, outdoor mountaineering clubs and conservation authorities. To this end the board has built up a useful liaison with these groups.

The question may now be asked "why a provincial board?" After all, the federal committee should be sufficient with one member in each province. The answer is that a single member in his own province is too often exposed to pressures and brandishments of individuals and organizations who might wish to perpetuate honours where such are not entirely forthcoming. Such pressures have been brought to bear upon single members who have all too often been unable to resist them. Secondly, a board of several members can profit by the opinion of the board - two heads are better than one holds

true and by thoroughly discussing the merits of a name it is easier for a wise decision to be reached. It should be clearly stated here that the Geographic Board of Alberta in no way intends to impose names upon features. Rather it invites suggestions where new names are concerned and also arbitrates to the best of its ability any dispute that may arise. This is not always an easy task for emotions can run high and sometimes it is best to let the matter rest until emotions have cooled. Some of the other provinces of Canada have taken steps to establish local geographic boards and in so doing they are of help to the Canadian Permanent Committee in that it will have the advice of the local bodies.

The relations between the Geographic Board of Alberta and the Canadian Permanent Committee have always been very close. The close liaison is maintained with both parties advising the other of new names or any changes in names that might appear. The Canadian Permanent Committee often sends maps to Alberta for checking. These are verified so that as much information as possible about the location and the source of the name are collected. On the other hand, if a new name is suggested and approved in Alberta, it is forwarded to the Canadian Permanent Committee for endorsation. If names are suggested from the Canadian Permanent Committee they may be approved by the Alberta Board and subsequently endorsed by the Canadian Permanent Committee. This simple procedure has much to recommend it. There is always liaison between neighbouring provinces where names are close to the borders of the provinces concerned or common to both provinces.

It is expected that the Geographic Board of Alberta will continue its useful work in the future. One of its projects which it hopes will eventually be realized is the publication of a new edition of *Place-Names of Alberta*. This appeared in 1928, with derivations of all the names then known in Alberta and which is of course out-of-date. The Alberta Board keeps a card file of names and their derivations to which new information is added as it is received.

IV - REPORTS OF THE FOUR COMMITTEES

The committees on *national standardization, geographical terms, writing systems* and *international cooperation* formed various small study groups, each of which examined a particular agenda item, drafted recommendations or resolutions and reported back to the committee in plenary session. Each committee submitted a draft report of its deliberations.

DRAFT REPORT OF COMMITTEE I - NATIONAL STANDARDIZATION

The following agenda items were considered by the Committee:

(a) *Field collection of names*
(b) *Office treatment of names*
(c) *Decisions relating to multilingual areas*
(d) *National gazetteers*
(e) *Administrative structure of national names authorities*
(f) *Automatic data processing*
(g) *Definition of national names authority*
(h) *Any other relevant matters*

The Committee considered 9(e) first and the remainder of its agenda in the listed order.

In addition to portions of the national reports considered in Plenary Session under items 7 and 8, the papers listed in the Annexure to this report are relevant to the Committee's work.

First meeting - 8 September

The Chairman gave a definition of the task of the Committee. National Standardization was defined in document E/Conf.53/L.1 as "the fixing by the country of the writing of the geographical names of that country in the official administrative language or languages of that country".

The Chairman referred to the Order of the Day, in which the main item has been subdivided into six parts and indicated that he would deal first

with item 9(e), "Administrative structure of national names authorities",
and afterwards with the other items in their listed order. The Committee's
objective is to produce draft resolutions. The relevant recommendations of
report of Group of Experts would be used as a basis.

Comments on papers submitted were made by delegates of Kenya, USA,
Guatemala, USSR, UK, Ghana, Spain, Switzerland. Questions discussed or
touched upon: Large or small national committees, composition, necessity
for having both linguists and cartographers and various authorities repre-
sented on committees, centralization versus decentralization, local
committees on nomenclature, permanent or ad hoc membership of administrative
bodies to deal with geographical names, diversity of conditions and ex-
periences.

Proposals for inclusion of more detailed recommendations and amendments
were submitted by delegates of the Netherlands, of Austria and of Kenya.
These proposals were referred to a working group charged with formulating
recommendations on National Names Authorities. Members accepting nomination
for the Working Group on "Administrative structure of national names authori-
ties" were Dr. Breu (Austria) convener, Mr. Simpson (Ghana), Mr. Geelan (UK)
and Dr. Ormeling (Netherlands).

The Committee then went on to consider item 9(a), "Field collection of
names". Reports on work done or in progress in this field were given by
delegates of the USSR, the USA, Mr. Dahlberg of Surinam (delegation of the
Netherlands). In an exchange of experiences and background information,
various points were mentioned by delegates of the USA, UK, France, Switzer-
land, such as: Use of tape recorders in the field (Dr. Burrill, supported
by delegate of the UK); the delegate of the USSR gave a survey of how names
were collected in the field in the USSR, supported the use of linguistic
experts. The delegate of France stressed the importance of finding good
informants. The problems created by air-photography were discussed by the
delegate of the USSR. The delegate of the UK mentioned the point that
air-photographs are often better than maps when informants are asked to
locate a name as many people cannot read maps but they find things on
photographs.

Amendments to relevant recommendations (second part of Recommendation I
of the Expert Group) were submitted by the delegates of the USA, the UK,
Ghana and the USSR.

A working group to consider these questions and to draft recommenda-
tions on "Field collection of names" was set up. The members of the working
group were Mr. Nédélec (France) convener, Mr. Poirier (Canada), Mr. Komkov
(USSR), Mr. Marty (Cameroon) and Mr. Hovda (Norway).

The Chairman asked those who had proposals for amendments to make to
write them down and hand them to the conveners, and the committees were
asked to take into account the facts and general information that had been
brought out by the preceding discussion.

The Chairman opened the meeting, referred to the Order of the Day, drew attention to the definition of a National Names Authority in document E/Conf.53/L.2 proposed the addition of one further item to the agenda: (h) "Any additional matters". The Chairman invited comment on the proposals and, if none, on the items on the agenda. The first point to be discussed was item 9(b) "Office treatment of names". The delegate of Norway called attention to the fact that names are part of national heritage. Both linguists and cartographers are necessary for office treatment of names; linguists decide on the spelling of names, topographers decide which names to include and the exact location on maps. The delegate of Monaco read a paper on work carried out in this field in Monaco, stressed the interest of the International Tourist Bureau in standardization work.

The delegate of the USA drew attention to document E/Conf.53/L.53 and a document to be distributed on instructions to field personnel for collecting names and for office treatment of them, issued by the United States Geological Survey. The delegate of the Netherlands wished to include a recommendation for the adaptation of spellings of place-names to the orthographic system used in that country. The delegates of Austria and the Federal Republic of Germany pointed out difficulties. The delegate of the Netherlands proposed that a recommendation should be included to adapt spellings of place-names as far as possible to the existing spelling system of the language.

The Chairman asked that the members of the committee should consider those parts of the recommendations of the Group of Experts which deal with office treatment of names, and proposed that a revised text of these recommendations be used as a basis for the draft recommendations to be formulated by a special working group. The reformulation of the recommendations of the Expert Group was read by the Chairman at dictation speed. After some remarks and questions on minor points these were accepted for reference to a working group to consider the recommendations on office treatment. This working group on "Office Treatment of Names" was then set up. The members were: Mr. Holmgren (Canada) convener, Dr. Blok (The Netherlands), Dr. Hovda (Norway), Mr. Marty (Cameroon), Dr. Jones (Liberia), Mr. Rouse (USA).

The next item on the agenda was 9(c) "Decisions relating to multilingual areas". The delegate of Austria asked for the inclusion of a recommendation to all countries with minority languages that due regard should be paid in maps to names in the language of a minority population. Delegates of the USSR, the UK, and the USA spoke on this point. They pointed out that it was difficult to define the term "minority language" and warned against too specific recommendations. It was argued that recommendation VII of the Expert Group covered the case raised by the delegate of Austria. A special working group to formulate a recommendation on this point was set up. The members of this working group were: Professor Spiess (Switzerland) convener, Dr. Breu (Austria), Mr. Mostofi (Iran), Mr. Rosu (Romania).

Next, the Committee considered item 9 (d) "National Gazetteers". The chairman proposed the reformulation of the relevant recommendations of the

Group of Experts. The reformulation was accepted for reference to a Working Group after inclusion of a short addition proposed by the delegate of the USA.

A working group to draft recommendations on National Gazetteers was set up. The members of the group were: Col. Khamasundara (Thailand) convener, Mr. Kuzmin (USSR), Mr. Andriamihaja (Madagascar), Mr. Bloom (USA), Mr. Hoffman and Dr. Eggers (Federal Republic of Germany).

The next item was 9(f) "Automatic Data Processing". The delegate of the USA (Dr. Burrill) gave a summary of work done in the USA. There were some questions and discussion on various points, the use of punch cards versus tape, difficulties in handling diacritical marks, long names, etc. The Delegate of the UK stated that tape seemed to offer the greatest advantages. Those taking part in discussions were delegates from the USA, the USSR, the UK, the Netherlands, France and the Federal Republic of Germany. A Working group to formulate appropriate recommendations was set up. Members of this group were: Dr. Meynen (Federal Republic of Germany) convener, Mr. Kuzmin (USSR), Dr. Burrill (USA), Mr. Lewis (UK) and Mr. Pégorier (France).

The Chairman raised the question of the Definition of a National Names Authority in E/Conf.53/L.2, page 16 and suggested inclusion of the words "or co-ordinated group of bodies". This was accepted.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1 – NATIONAL NAMES AUTHORITY

As a first step in international standardization of geographical names, each country should have a *national names authority:*

(a) consisting of a continuing body, or co-ordinated group of bodies, having clearly stated authority and instructions for the standardization of names and the determination of names standardization policy within the country;

(b) having such status, composition, function and procedures as will
  (i)   be consistent with the governmental structure of the country;
  (ii) give the greatest chance of success in the national name standardization programme;
  (iii) as appropriate, provide within its framework for the establishment of regional or local committees according to area or language;
  (iv) provide for consideration of the effects of its actions on government agencies, private organizations and other groups and for the reconciliation of these interests, as far as possible, with the long range interests of the country as a whole;
  (v)   make full use of the services of surveyors, cartographers, geographers, linguists and any other experts who may help the authority to efficiently carry out its operations;
  (vi) permit of record keeping and publication procedures that will facilitate the prompt and wide distribution of information on its standardized names both nationally and internationally.

It is recommended that those countries which have not yet begun to exercise their prerogative of standardizing their names on a national basis, now proceed to do so.

It is further recommended that the appropriate United Nations office be kept informed by each national names authority of its composition and functions, and of the address of its Secretary.

ANNEX TO REPORT OF COMMITTEE I

DOCUMENTS RELATIVE TO NATIONAL STANDARDIZATION

Administrative structure of national names authorities	(Kenya)	)	E/Conf.53/L.5
National gazetteers	(New Zealand	)	E/Conf.53/L.7
Codification of geographical names for United States Government needs	(USA)	)	E/Conf.53/L.16
Identification code numbers for administrative divisions in Thailand	(Thailand)	)	E/Conf.53/L.18
National Gazetteers	(Thailand)	)	E/Conf.53/L.19
National standardization and writing systems	(Cyprus)	)	E/Conf.53/L.24
Guidelines for preparing and submitting proposals regarding domestic geographical names	(USA)	)	E/Conf.53/L.33
Problems of geographic names standardization experienced in a multinational country	(USSR)	)	E/Conf.53/L.41
Field geographic names reports	(USA)	)	E/Conf.53/L.53
Decision relating to multilingual areas	(USA)	)	E/Conf.53/L.55
Administrative structure of national names authorities	(Canada)	)	E/Conf.53/L.56
Names on ordnance survey maps and plans	(UK)	)	E/Conf.53/L.58
Normalisation national et répertoires géographiques	(France)	)	E/Conf.53/L.60
Normalisation nationale	(France)	)	E/Conf.53/L.62
Principles and procedures	(Canada)	)	E/Conf.53/L.63
Gazetteer of Canada	(Canada)	)	E/Conf.53/L.64
Topographic instructions of the U.S. Geological Survey - Geographic Names	(USA)	)	
Collection and treatment of geographical names of Sweden	(Sweden)	)	E/Conf.53/L.66
Automation of undersea feature names	(USA)	)	E/Conf.53/L.72

PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION I - NORMALISATION NATIONALE

La Commission a examiné les points ci-après:

a) *Recherche sur le terrain des données relatives aux noms géographiques*
b) *Traitment des noms géographiques au bureau*

c) *Décisions relatives aux régions multilingues*
d) *Nomenclatures nationales*
e) *Structure administrative des organismes nationaux qui s'occupent*
des noms géographiques
f) *Exploitation automatique des données*
g) *Définition du "Service national des noms géographiques"*
h) *Toutes autres questions connexes.*

La Commission a examiné en premier lieu l'alinéa e) du point 9, puis le reste de son ordre du jour dans l'ordre indiqué ci-dessus.

En plus des parties des rapports nationaux qui ont été examinées en séance plénière au titre des points 7 et 8 de l'ordre du jour, les documents dont la liste est donnée dans l'annexe au présent rapport ont un lien avec les travaux de la Commission.

Première séance - 8 septembre

Le Président a défini la tâche de la Commission. Le document E/Conf.53/L.1 considérait la normalisation nationale comme "la détermination par chaque pays de la graphie des noms géographiques de ce pays dans la langue adminis-trative officielle (ou les langues administratives officielles) de ce pays".

Le Président s'est référé au programme journalier, où le point 9 était subdivisé en six alinéas, et il a indiqué qu'il traiterait d'abord de l'alinéa 9 e) intitulé "Structure administrative des organismes nationaux qui s'occupent des noms géographiques", et ensuite des autres alinéas dans l'ordre indiqué. L'objectif de la Commission était de préparer des projets de résolution. Les recommandations pertinentes du rapport du Groupe d'experts serviraient de base pour ce travail.

Les représentants du Kenya, des Etats-Unis, du Guatemala, de l'URSS, du Royaume-Uni, du Ghana, de l'Espagne et de la Suisse ont formulé des observa-tions au sujet des documents présentés. Parmi les questions examinées ou abordées figurent les suivantes: importance numérique des comités nationaux, composition, nécessité d'y faire entrer à la fois des linguistes et des cartographes et d'y faire représenter diverses autorités, centralisation ou décentralisation, comités locaux chargés des nomenclatures, question de sa-voir si les membres des organismes administratifs chargés des noms géographi-ques doivent siéger dans ces organes à titre permanent ou spécial, diversité des conditions et données d'expérience.

Les représentants des Pays-Bas, de l'Autriche et du Kenya ont soumis des propositions tendant à faire adopter des recommandations plus détaillées et des amendements. Ces propositions ont été renvoyées à un groupe de travail chargé de formuler des recommandations au sujet des organismes nationaux s'occupant des noms géographiques. Les membres qui ont accepté de siéger au groupe de travail sur la "structure administrative des organismes qui s'occu-pent des noms géographiques" étaient M. Breu (Autriche), convocateur, M. Simpson (Ghana), M. Geelan (Royaume-Uni) et M. Ormeling (Pays-Bas).

La Commission a ensuite abordé l'alinéa a) du point 9, intitulé "Recher-che sur le terrain des données relatives aux noms géographiques". Le repré-sentant de l'URSS, le représentant des Etats-Unis et M. Dahlberg, du Surinam

(délégation des Pays-Bas) ont fait rapport sur les travaux accomplis ou les progrès réalisés dans ce domaine. Au cours d'un échange de renseignements et de données d'expérience, les représentants des Etats-Unis, du Royaume-Uni, de la France et de la Suisse ont mentionné divers points: M. Burrill, appuyé par le représentant du Royaume-Uni, a parlé de l'utilisation de magnétophones pour les opérations sur le terrain; le représentant de l'URSS a indiqué comment les données relatives aux noms géographiques sont recueillies locale-ment en URSS, avec l'appui d'experts linguistiques. Le représentant de la France a souligné l'importance qu'il y a à trouver de bons informateurs. Le représentant de l'URSS a parlé des problèmes soulevés par la photographie aérienne. Le représentant du Royaume-Uni a souligné que les photographies aériennes sont souvent préférables aux cartes lorsqu'on demande aux informa-teurs de localiser un nom, car de nombreuses personnes ne savent pas lire les cartes mais peuvent repérer les détails sur les photographies.

Les représentants des Etats-Unis, du Royaume-Uni, du Ghana et de l'URSS ont soumis des amendements aux recommandations connexes (deuxième partie de la recommandation I du Groupe d'experts).

Un groupe de travail a été constitué pour examiner ces questions et ré-diger des recommandations en ce qui concerne la "recherche sur le terrain des données relatives aux noms géographiques". Les membres de ce groupe de travail étaient M. Nélélec (France), convocateur, M. Poirier (Canada), M. Komkov (URSS), M. Marty (Cameroun) et M. Hovda (Norvège).

Le Président a demandé à ceux qui avaient des propositions d'amendement à présenter de les consigner par écrit et de les transmettre aux convocateurs, et les groupes de travail ont été invités à tenir compte des faits et des renseignements généraux mis en lumière au cours de la discussion précédente.

Deuxième séance - 12 septembre

Le Président a ouvert la séance, a parlé du programme journalier, a appelé l'attention sur la définition donnée dans le document E/Conf.53/L.2 de l'organisme national s'occupant des noms géographiques, et il a proposé d'ajouter à l'ordre du jour un autre point intitulé: h) "Toutes questions supplémentaires". Le Président a invité les membres à faire des observations sur les propositions ou, sinon, sur les points de l'ordre du jour. Le premier point en discussion était le point 9 b), "Traitement des noms géographiques au bureau". Le représentant de la Norvège a souligné que les noms font partie de l'héritage national. Pour assurer le traitement des noms géogra-phiques au bureau, il faut à la fois des linguistes et des cartographes; les linguistes décident de l'orthographe des noms, les topographes choisissent les noms à faire figurer sur la carte et y déterminent l'emplacement exact. Le représentant de Monaco a lu un exposé sur les travaux effectués dans ce domaine à Monaco et il a souligné l'intérêt que le Bureau international du tourisme porte aux travaux de normalisation.

Le représentant des Etats-Unis a appelé l'attention sur le document E/Conf.53/L.53 et sur un document du *Geological Survey* des Etats-Unis qui devrait être distribué et qui contenait des instructions au personnel chargé de recueillir des données sur le terrain au sujet des noms géographiques et d'assurer leur traitement au bureau. Le représentant des Pays-Bas a demandé à inclure une recommandation tendant à ce que la graphie des noms de lieux

soit alignée sur le système orthographique employé dans ce pays. Les repré-
sentants de l'Autriche et de la République fédérale d'Allemagne ont parlé
des difficultés que cela soulèverait. Le représentant des Pays-Bas a proposé
d'insérer une recommandation tendant à ce que la graphie des noms de lieux
soit adaptée autant que possible au système de graphie utilisé pour la langue
considérée.

Le Président a demandé que les membres de la Commission examinent les
parties des recommandations du Groupe d'experts qui concernent le traitement
des noms géographiques au bureau et il a proposé qu'un texte revisé de ces
recommandations serve de base pour les projets de recommandations qu'élabore-
rait un groupe de travail spécial. Le Président a lu à vitesse de dictée le
texte modifié des recommandations du Groupe d'experts. Après quelques re-
marques et questions portant sur des points mineurs, ces recommandations ont
été acceptées en vue de leur renvoi à un groupe de travail chargé d'examiner
les recommandations relatives au traitement des noms géographiques au bureau.
Ce groupe de travail sur "le traitement des noms géographiques au bureau" a
alors été crée. Il se composait de: M. Holmgren (Canada), convocateur,
M. Blok (Pays-Bas), M. Hovda (Norvège), M. Marty (Cameroun), M. Jones (Liberia),
M. Rousse (Etats-Unis d'Amérique).

Le point suivant de l'ordre du jour était le point 9 c), intitulé
"Décisions relatives aux régions multilingues". Le représentant de l'Autriche
a préconisé l'adoption d'une recommandation invitant tous les pays où sont
parlées des langues de minorités à tenir dûment compte, pour l'établissement
des cartes, des noms employés dans la langue de la population minoritaire.
Les représentants de l'URSS, du Royaume-Uni et des Etats-Unis ont pris la
parole à ce sujet. Ils ont souligné qu'il était difficile de définir l'ex-
pression "langue de minorité" et ils ont fait ressortir les dangers de
recommandations trop précises. On a fait valoir que la recommandation VII du
Groupe d'experts répondait au point soulevé par le représentant de l'Autriche.
Un groupe de travail spécial chargé de formuler une recommandation à ce sujet
à été crée. Les membres de ce groupe de travail étaient le Professeur Spiess
(Suisse) convocateur, M. Breu (Autriche), M. Mostofi (Iran), M. Rosu
(Roumanie).

La Commission a ensuite abordé le point 9 d), intitulé "Nomenclature
nationales". Le Président a proposé de modifier le texte des recommandations
formulées à ce sujet par le Groupe d'experts. Le nouveau texte a été accepté
en vue d'être renvoyé à un groupe de travail, après adjonction de quelques
mots proposée par le représentant des Etats-Unis.

Le groupe de travail chargé d'élaborer des projets de recommandation
sur les nomenclatures nationales a été crée. Il se composait du Colonel
Khamasundara (Thailande), convocateur, de M. Kuzmin (URSS), M. Andriamihaja
(Madagascar), M. Bloom (Etats-Unis), M. Hoffman et M. Eggers (République
fédérale d'Allemagne).

Le point suivant était le point 9 f), "Exploitation automatique des
données". Le représentant des Etats-Unis (M. Burrill) a donné un bref aperçu
des travaux effectués aux Etats-Unis. Quelques questions ont été posées et
un débat a eu lieu sur divers points, notamment les avantages respectifs des
cartes perforées et des rubans magnétiques, les difficultés soulevées par
les signes diacritiques, les noms relativement longs, etc. Le représentant

du Royaume-Uni a déclaré que le ruban magnétique semblait offrir les plus
grands avantages. Ont participé au débat les représentants des États-Unis,
de l'URSS, du Royaume-Uni, des Pays-Bas, de la France et de la République
fédérale d'Allemagne. Un groupe de travail chargé de formuler des recomman-
dations appropriées a été créé. Il se composait de M. Meynen (République
fédérale d'Allemagne), convocateur, M. Kuzmin (URSS), M. Burrill (États-Unis),
M. Lewis (Royaume-Uni) et M. Pégorier (France).

Le Président a soulevé la question de la définition de l'organisme
national s'occupant des noms géographiques, telle qu'elle figure dans le
document E/Conf.53/L.2, et il a suggéré d'ajouter les mots "ou un groupe
coordonné d'organes". Cette suggestion a été acceptée.

RECOMMANDATION NO 1 - ORGANISME NATIONAL CHARGE DES NOMS GEOGRAPHIQUES

Au titre de première mesure en vue de la normalisation internationale des
noms géographiques, chaque pays devrait se doter d'un *organisme national des
noms géographiques*:

a) consistant en un organe permanent ou en un groupe coordonné d'organes
ayant des attributions et des instructions nettement définies en ce
qui concerne la normalisation des noms et la fixation des principes
à appliquer pour la normalisation des noms à l'intérieur du pays;

b) ayant un statut, une composition, des fonctions et des méthodes qui

   i) soient compatibles avec la structure des pouvoirs publics du
pays;

   ii) offrent les plus grandes chances de succès au programme
national de normalisation des noms géographiques;

   iii) lui permettent de créer, selon qu'il conviendra, des comités
régionaux ou locaux chargés d'une zone ou d'une langue;

   iv) l'amènent à se préoccuper des effets de ses décisions sur les
service de l'État, les organisations privées et autres grou-
pes et à concilier dans toute la mesure possible les intérêts
de ces éléments avec l'intérêt durable de l'ensemble du pays;

   v) lui fassent tirer pleinement parti des services de topographes,
de cartographes, géographes, linguistes et tous autres experts
qui peuvent l'aider à mener à bien ses opérations avec effi-
cacité;

   vi) lui permettent d'employer des méthodes d'enregistrement et de
publication facilitant la diffusion rapide et étendue, à
l'échelle nationale aussi bien qu'internationale, de rensei-
gnements sur les noms qu'il aura normalisés.

Il est recommandé que les pays qui n'ont pas encore commencé à normaliser
leurs noms géographiques à l'échelle nationale exercent dès maintenant cette
prérogative.

Il est recommandé en outre que chaque organisme national des noms géo-
graphiques informe le service approprié de l'Organisation des Nations Unies
de sa composition et de ses fonctions, ainsi que de l'adresse de son secré-
taire.

DOCUMENTS RELATIFS AU NORMALISATION NATIONALE

Structure administrative des organismes nationaux qui s'occupent des noms géographiques	(Kenya)	)) E/Conf.53/L.5)
Nomenclatures nationales	(Nouvelle-Zélande)	E/Conf.53/L.7
Codification des noms géographiques en égard aux besoins du gouvernement des Etats-Unis	(Etats-Unis)	) E/Conf.53/L.16)
Notations chiffrées pour la désignation des divisions administratives de Thailande	(Thailande)	) E/Conf.53/L.18)
Nomenclatures nationales	(Thailande)	) E/Conf.53/L.19
Normalisation nationale et systèmes d'écriture	(Chypre)	) E/Conf.53/L.24)
Guidelines for preparing and submitting proposals regarding domestic geographical names	(Etats-Unis)	)) E/Conf.53/L.33)
Problèmes qui se posent dans un pays à nationalités multiples pour la normalisation des noms géographiques	(URSS)	)) E/Conf.53/L.41)
Field geographic names reports	(Etats-Unis)	) E/Conf.53/L.53
Decision relating to multilingual areas	(Etats-Unis)	) E/Conf.53/L.55
Administrative structure of national names authorities	(Canada)	)) E/Conf.53/L.56
Names on ordnance survey maps and plans	(Royaume-Uni)	) E/Conf.53/L.58
Normalisation nationale et répertoires géographiques	(France)	) E/Conf.53/L.60
Normalisation nationale	(France)	) E/Conf.53/L.62
Principles and Procedures	(Canada)	) E/Conf.53/L.63
Gazetteer of Canada	(Canada)	) E/Conf.53/L.64
Topographic instructions of the U.S. Geological Survey - Geographic Names	(Etats-Unis)	))
Collection and treatment of geographical names of Sweden	(Suède)	)) E/Conf.53/L.66
Automation of undersea feature names	(Etats-Unis)	) E/Conf.53/L.72

DRAFT REPORT OF COMMISSION II - GEOGRAPHICAL TERMS

The following agenda items were considered by the Committee:

(a) *Generic terms*
(b) *Categories*
(c) *Glossaries*
(d) *Symbolization*

The Committee considered its agenda in the listed order. The papers listed below are relevant to the Committee's work:

Report of the Group of Experts	E/Conf.53/L.1
Extracts from World Cartography, Volume VII	E/Conf.53/L.2
Glossaries (USA)	E/Conf.53/L.28
Geographic terms (USSR)	E/Conf.53/L.50

First meeting - 8 September

The Committee held its first meeting at 3 p.m. on 8 September. The delegates of the Netherlands, USSR, Federal Republic of Germany, Austria and Spain referred to the definition *generic term* appearing as Annex I - List of selected technical terms - (document E/Conf.53/L.1)as not fully satisfactory and mentioned some examples, within the general comments.

During the discussion, the term *category* appearing in the above-mentioned document was described as not fully satisfactory to all delegates as expressed by the United States of America, Norway, Lebanon, China, France, United Kingdom and USSR who mentioned in discussion the existence of a large variety of categories regarding generic terms and gave some examples. The Delegate of Austria proposed that Recommendation XI be revised, taking the following into account:

Elaboration of a glossary of generic terms
Elaboration of a list of categories.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom, seconded by the Delegate of the USA, mentioned that this would imply a large amount of work, and that he was in favour of having a Working Group formed, which should propose definitions of *generic term* and *categories* for our specific purpose.

The Committee then went on to consider item 10(c), *Glossaries*. The dele-
gates of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Norway, the United States of
America, Ghana, Austria, France, the USSR, the Federal Republic of Germany
and Switzerland discussed this item at length and decided that the first
necessity was to have a definition of the term *glossaries*. As for item
10(d) *Symbolization*, the delegate of the United States of America mentioned
the fact that documentation exists on this subject which could be consulted.

The Chairman set up a Working Group to consider the items which had
been discussed and to prepare the definitions, as follows: Mr. Ayoubi
(Lebanon) convener, Mr. Meynen (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Mutziger
(USA), Mr. Murzaev (USSR), Mr. Shickle (UK), Mr. Corderas (Spain), Mr.
Pégorier (France), Mr. Sun (China) and Mr. Blok (Netherlands) as rapporteur.

The Committee received from the delegate of the Holy See a draft reso-
lution regarding the Study Centre of Religious Toponomy of the Vatican City.
which proposes to publish a bibliographical bulletin. As this draft reso-
lution did not fall within the scope of Committee II, the Chairman directed
it should be submitted to Committee III.

The meeting adjourned at 6.00 p.m.

Second meeting - 18 September

The Chairman opened the meeting at 3.00 p.m., referred to the Order of the
Day and invited comments on the draft report of the last meeting prepared
by the rapporteur. Discussion followed and the delegates of Austria,
Cameroon and Australia proposed some amendments. The Chairman requested
that those delegates who wished to have their amendments inserted in the
report of the rapporteur should contact him before 10.00 a.m. next morning.

Next, the Committee considered draft recommendation XII prepared by
the Working Group. The delegates of the USA, the UK, Kenya, Austria and
France proposed some amendments, as well as the delegate of the USSR who
took part in the discussions. The Chairman instructed the Working Group
to take into account the proposals made and to prepare a new draft.

The next item was the draft of recommendation XIII. Those taking part
in the discussions were the delegates of France, the Netherlands, USA,
USSR, Mexico, Ghana, Kenya, UK, Hungary and Austria and the Chairman direct-
ed the Working Group to redraft the recommendation as proposed.

The Chairman invited discussion on item 10(a), (b), (c) and (d),
dealing with geographical terms. The delegates of Austria, Ghana, USSR,
Poland, Netherlands, Mexico, UK, Belgium and France spoke regarding the
definitions contained in the draft recommendation. The Chairman requested
that as some of the delegations formed part of the Working Group, which
was being enlarged to include Belgium, they should express their specific
points of view during its next meeting and work out suitable definitions
which would be practical for our specific purposes.

The Observer of the International Association of Cartography (ICA)
asked for the floor and mentioned that ICA is working on a dictionary of

technical cartographic terms and circulated a list of some of the terms to the delegates.

As time did not permit it, the Chairman left discussion of draft recommendation VII, proposed by Committee II, for the next meeting. He requested that the Working Group, enlarged by the addition of Dr. Herbillon (Belgium) as another of its members, should meet next morning at 9.00 a.m. in order to work on the new drafts as directed.

The meeting adjourned at 5.30 p.m.

Third meeting - 20 September

The Committee held its third meeting at 4.50 p.m. on 20 September. The draft reports of the first two meetings were discussed and the following amendments introduced.

Several delegates made comments on the second draft of Recommendation XII, regarding the study of the nature of geographical objects, and amendments were submitted.

The Committee then went on to consider the second draft of the definitions of *generic term, categories* and *glossary,* as submitted by the Working Group. These definitions were discussed in detail and it was resolved that *categories* be crossed out. As for *generic term,* minor amendments were introduced in the English text.

As time did not permit, discussion of draft Recommendation VII was left for the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

Fourth meeting - 21 September

The Committee held its fourth meeting at 9.30 a.m. on 21 September. The Chairman mentioned that the ad hoc Committee of the Group of Experts had met the previous evening and upon mentioning the names of the elected officers, the delegates applauded.

The definition of *generic term,* was discussed in its draft form. Finland proposed a new text; seconded by other delegates this text was approved.

The definition of *glossary,* was then discussed on the basis of the prepared draft. Several delegates proposed some amendments to the text, which was then approved.

Recommendation XII regarding geographical entities was discussed and some amendments made to the draft. Upon request of the delegates of Belgium and France, the French text was slightly modified. The original text in English was then approved.

The next item was the draft of Recommendation XIII pertaining to national gazetteers. With the amendments made, it was approved.

The text of the approved Resolution in their English and French versions will appear as documents of the Conference, as well as the English text of Resolution VII of the Group of Experts, referred by Committee III to Committee II.

The Chairman then addressed the delegates and thanked them on behalf of his country, Guatemala, for the privilege of having been elected to preside over Committee II. It was possible for him to carry out this difficult task thanks to the assistance of the other officers. He also expressed his appreciation to the Working Group for the wonderful work done, as well as to the Secretariat staff, and simultaneous interpreters for their magnificent aid and assistance, which had been essential to the Committee.

The Chairman then went on to declare the work of Committee II ended, and adjourned the meeting at 11 a.m.

PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION II - TERMES GEOGRAPHIQUES

La Commission a examiné les points suivants de l'ordre du jour:

(a) *Termes génériques*
(b) *Catégories*
(c) *Glossaires*
(d) *Symbolisation*

La Commission a examiné son ordre du jour dans l'ordre indiqué. Les documents afférents aux travaux de la Commission sont les suivants:

Rapport du Groupe d'experts	E/Conf.53/L.1
Extraits du volume VII de la Cartographie mondiale	E/Conf.53/L.2
Glossaires (Etats-Unis d'Amérique)	E/Conf.53/L.28
Termes géographiques (URSS)	E/Conf.53/L.50

Premiére séance - 8 septembre

La Commission a tenu sa première séance le 8 septembre à 15 heures. Les représentants des Pays-Bas, de l'URSS, de la République fédérale d'Allemagne, de l'Autriche et de l'Espagne ont déclaré que la définition du *terme générique* telle qu'elle figure à l'annexe I - "Liste de quelques termes techniques" - (document E/Conf.53/L.1) n'était pas entièrement satisfaisante et **ils** en ont donné quelques exemples dans le cadre de leurs observations d'ordre général.

Dans la discussion, il a été dit que le terme *catégorie* qui figure dans le document cité ci-dessus ne satisfaisait pas entièrement tous les représentants, ainsi que l'ont déclaré ceux des Etats-Unis d'Amérique, de la Norvège, du Liban, de la Chine, de la France, du Royaume-Uni et de l'URSS,qui ont indiqué au cours du débat qu'il existait des catégories trés variées se rapportant aux termes génériques et qui en ont donné

quelques exemples. Le représentant de l'Autriche a proposé de reviser la recommandation XI en tenant compte de:

     l'élaboration d'un glossaire des termes génériques,
     l'élaboration d'une liste de catégories.

     Le représentant du Royaume-Uni, appuyé par le représentant des Etats-Unis Unis d'Amérique, a déclaré qu'il y faudrait beaucoup de travail et qu'il était d'avis que soit constitué un groupe de travail qui proposerait des définitions de *terme générique* et de *catégories* appropriées aux fins visées.

     La Commission a examiné ensuite le point 10 c) relatif aux *Glossaires*. Les représentants des Pays-Bas, du Royaume-Uni, de la Norvège, des Etats-Unis d'Amérique, du Ghana, de l'Autriche, de la France, de l'URSS, de la République fédérale d'Allemagne et de la Suisse ont discuté ce point longuement et ont jugé qu'il convenait d'abord de définir le terme *glossaires*. Comme pour le point 9 d) relatif à la *Symbolisation,* le représentant des Etats-Unis d'Amérique a rappelé l'existence d'une documentation sur ce sujet, qui pourrait être consultée.

     Le Président a constitué un groupe de travail chargé d'examiner les points qui avaient fait l'objet d'une discussion et de préparer les définitions; ce groupe a été ainsi composé: M. Ayoubi (Liban) (convocateur), M. Meynen (République fédérale d'Allemagne), M. Mutziger (Etats-Unis d'Amérique), M. Mourzaev (URSS), M. Shickle (Royaume-Uni), M. Corderas (Espagne), M. Pégorier (France), M. Sun (Chine) et M. Blok (Pays-Bas) (rapporteur).

     La Commission a été saisie par le représentant du Saint-Siège d'un projet de résolution relatif au Centre d'étude de toponymie religieuse du Vatican, qui se propose de publier un bulletin bibliographique. Ce projet de résolution n'entrant pas dans le cadre des travaux de la Commission II, le Président a décidé d'en saisir la Commission III.

     La séance a été levée à 18 heures.

Deuxième séance - 18 septembre

Le Président a ouvert la séance à 15 heures, a rappelé l'ordre du jour et a invité les représentants à présenter leurs observations sur le projet du rapport de la séance précédente, établi par le Rapporteur. Un débat s'est engagé et les représentants de l'Autriche, du Cameroun et de l'Australie ont proposé des amendements. Le Président a demandé aux représentants désireux de faire insérer ces amendements dans le rapport de prendre contact avec le Rapporteur avant le lendemain matin 10 heures.

     La Commission a examiné ensuite le projet de recommandation XII préparé par le Groupe de travail. Les représentants des Etats-Unis,d'Amérique, du Royaume-Uni du Kenya, de l'Autriche et de la France ont proposé des amendements et le représentant de l'URSS est intervenu également. Le Président a invité le Groupe de travail à tenir compte des propositions faites et à présenter un nouveau projet.

     Le point suivant à l'ordre du jour avait trait au projet de recommandation XIII. Les représentants de la France, des Pays-Bas, des Etats-Unis,

de l'URSS, du Mexique, du Ghana, du Kenya, du Royaume-Uni, de la Hongrie et de l'Autriche sont intervenus dans le débat et le Président a chargé le Groupe de travail de remanier la recommandation dans le sens proposé.

Le Président a invité les représentants à examiner le point 10 a), b), c) et d) relatif aux termes géographiques. Les interventions des représentants de l'Autriche, du Ghana, de l'URSS, de la Pologne, des Pays-Bas, du Mexique, du Royaume-Uni, de la Belgique et de la France ont porté sur les définitions qui figurent dans le projet de recommandation. Certaines délégations étant représentées au Groupe de travail et ce dernier étant élargi pour y faire entrer la Belgique, le Président a demandé à leurs représentants d'exprimer leurs vues particulières à la séance suivant et d'élaborer des définitions appropriées aux fins visées.

L'observateur de l'Association cartographique internationale (ACI) a demandé la parole et a déclaré que l'ACI prépare un dictionnaire des termes techniques employés en cartographie; il a distribué aux représentants une liste de certains de ces termes.

Faute de temps, le Président a ajourné à la séance suivante la discussion du projet de recommandation VII proposé par la Commission II. Il a demandé que le Groupe de travail, élargi par l'entrée du Dr Herbillon (Belgique) en qualité de membre, se réunisse le lendemain matin à 9 heures pour rédiger les nouveaux projets dans le sens indiqué.

La séance est levée à 17 h. 30.

Troisième séance - 20 septembre

La Commission a tenu sa troisième séance le 20 septembre à 16 h. 50. Les projets de rapport des deux premières séances ont été examinés et modifiés.

Plusieurs représentants ont fait des observations sur le deuxième projet de recommandation XII relatif à l'étude de la nature des entités géographiques, et des amendements ont été présentés.

La Commission a examiné ensuite le deuxième projet présenté par le Groupe d'experts sur les définitions de *terme générique* de *catégories* et de *glossaire*. Ces définitions ont été discutées en détail et il a été décidé de supprimer *catégories*. Des modifications de rédaction ont été apportées au texte anglais de la définition de *terme générique*.

L'examen du projet de recommandation VII a été ajourné, faute de temps, à la séance du lendemain.

La séance a été levée à 18 h. 05.

Quatrième séance - 21 septembre

La Commission a tenu sa quatrième séance le 21 septembre à 9 h 30. Le Président a fait connaître que le Comité spécial du Groupe d'experts s'était réuni la veille et des applaudissements ont salué les noms des membres de son bureau.

Le projet de définition de *terme générique* a été examiné. Le représentant de la Finlande a proposé un nouveau texte que d'autres représentants ont appuyé et qui a été approuvé.

Le projet de définition de *glossaire* a été examiné. Plusieurs représentants ont proposé des amendements au texte qui a été ensuite approuvé.

La recommandation XII relative aux entités géographiques a été examinée et des amendements ont été apportés au projet. A la demande des représentants de la Belgique et de la France, le texte français a été légèrement remanié. Le texte original anglais a été ensuite approuvé.

Le point suivant concernait le projet de recommandation XIII relatif aux nomenclatures nationales. Il a été approuvé avec les modifications apportées.

Les versions anglaise et française des résolutions approuvées seront publiées comme documents de la Conférence ainsi que la version anglaise de la résolution VII du Groupe d'experts, renvoyée par la Commission III à la Commission II.

Le Président s'est ensuite adressé aux représentants et les a remerciés au nom de son pays, le Guatemala, de lui avoir fait l'honneur de l'élire à la présidence de la Commission II. L'appui des autres membres du bureau lui a permis de remplir cette tâche difficile. Il a également exprimé au Groupe d'experts sa gratitude pour l'excellent travail qu'il a accompli, ainsi qu'au personnel du secrétariat et aux interprètes dont l'aide et l'assistance ont été précieuses à la Commission.

Le Président a prononcé ensuite la clôture des travaux de la Commission II et a levé la séance à 11 heures.

DRAFT REPORT OF COMMITTEE III - WRITING SYSTEMS

First session - 6 September

The Chairman of Committee III, Mr. H.A.G. Lewis (United Kingdom) opened the session by reviewing the list of documents to be discussed and proposed that the subject of the transference of names should be divided into four categories:

(i)   from ideograms
(ii)   from syllabic scripts
(iii) from the Roman alphabet
(iv)   from non-Roman scripts

The Chairman drew attention to the Report of the Group of Experts (E/Conf.53/L.1 and L.2) and specifically to Recommendation VII in the latter paper. The Chairman asked delegates to note that Recommendation VII was concerned with both national standardization and with the transference of names from one writing system to another and therefore was for consideration by both Committee I and Committee III. As far as Committee III was concerned, aspects of transliteration and transcription would be discussed; other subject matter would be referred to Committee I as necessary. Mr. Lambert, Chairman of Committee I, agreed that the two Committees would coordinate their activities.

The delegate of the United States of America drew attention to document E/Conf.53/L.26, which must be studied in conjunction with L.26/Add.1. It was accepted that the principles governing transference from a given writing system to another were not necessarily the same as those for transference in the reverse direction. The delegate of Norway drew attention to the difficulties involved in many countries because of the varying phonetic value attributed to the letters of the Roman alphabet, and proposed the creation of a Roman alphabet with as few special signs as possible for international use. The delegate of the Federal Republic of Germany proposed that nations whose writing system was other than the Roman alphabet should establish an official system of transliteration and that for a given language there should be one single system. The delegates of Spain, Mexico, Germany and Austria questioned the definitions of the words "transcription" and "transliteration" as given in E/Conf.53/L.2. A Working Party was formed to draft new definitions and it was agreed that provisionally the

definitions given in E/Conf.53/L.2 should be accepted as working definitions for Committee III.

The delegate of the USSR drew attention to the special problems of transcription from the Roman alphabet into Cyrillic. The Chairman proposed the acceptance of a further guiding principle: in determining the method of transference of names from a given writing system into another, the decisive factor should be the preference of the users of the latter or "receiver" system.

Second session - 6 September

The Chairman announced the composition of a Working Group on Recommendation VII to consist of the representatives of Iran (convener), USA, UK, USSR, France, Libya and Ethiopia.

The delegate of Ghana said that Recommendation VII was acceptable to him and that the numerous languages of his country could be recorded in the Roman alphabet with the help of a few special letters. The delegate of Norway said that in his country Lappish names were treated similarly. The Chairman recommended the avoidance of special letters of unfamiliar form. The delegate of the USSR said that it was the practice in his country to record non-Russian languages in the Cyrillic alphabet without special letters or signs even though this might mean a loss of phonetic accuracy. Geographical names should not be written in a different form from ordinary words. The delegates of the USA and Kenya agreed in deprecating the use of unfamiliar signs.

The delegate of the UK pointed out that it was possible to distinguish a "reference form" of a name used for practical purposes from an "information form" affording greater precision. The delegate of the USA, however, preferred the use of a single transcription.

The delegate of the USSR said that in view of the diverse values assigned to Roman alphabet letters in the various countries using that alphabet, his country had adopted for the English-language version of their world atlas a system for transcribing names from Cyrillic characters similar to that of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) but with a number of modifications.

At the Chairman's request the representative of the International Organization for Standardization explained that the systems adopted by the latter for transliteration from various scripts were arrived at by agreement among the national standardization organizations and that some of the systems were currently undergoing modification. The delegates of France and the UK said that the standardization organizations of their respective countries were private and not official bodies.

Third session - 13 September

The Chairman invited the delegate of Austria to join the Working Group set up at the previous session. He proposed for discussion the question of the recording of names in multi-lingual areas or in unwritten languages. The delegate of the USSR said that the practice in his country for the transcription of names from less known or unwritten languages was to use diacritics or the international phonetic alphabet (IPA). The delegates of Ghana and

Liberia also favoured the IPA, but the representative of Kenya said there was sometimes difficulty in finding name-recorders who were familiar with it. The delegate of Cameroon thought it desirable to use English or French transcriptions which might be approximate rather than wait for skilled linguists to achieve more perfect ones. The delegate of USA preferred direct transference from the unwritten language to that used on the map. The delegate of Norway said that the main requirements were that the name as transcribed should be recognizable by the local people, and that those to whom it was not previously known should be able to pronounce it correctly. Tape-recording had been useful in the case of Lapp names. The Chairman said it was agreed that the IPA might be useful but that it was not the only suitable method: the alphabet of a kindred written language might also be used. The delegate of USA said that tape-recorders of a size suitable for use in the field might not be sufficiently accurate. The Chairman added that difficulty was caused by names which changed their pronunciation in declension.

Reverting to the treatment of languages already possessing a script, the Chairman opened the question whether transcription or transliteration was preferable. The delegate of USA said that it depended on whether the script from which names were being rendered was phonetic or not: in the former case transliteration was suitable.

The delegate of Austria suggested that it would be appropriate for the Conference to accept the systems of transliteration devised by the ISO, subject to minor amendments, if necessary. The Chairman, supported by the delegate of the USA, said that the Committee should consider all existing systems carefully and make appropriate recommendations within the UN framework. The delegate of the UK said that the ISO systems were not primarily devised for geographers but for documentation, bibliography, etc., and that to adopt them would simply mean adding one more to the number of systems already proposed for each language or writing system. The delegate of the Federal Republic of Germany supported the Austrian proposal. The representative of the ISO undertook to distribute to the Committee copies of the systems devised by his organization for Cyrillic, Arabic and Hebrew. He explained that these systems reflected a large measure of international agreement among ISO Member Bodies, which included a wide cross-section of users of the Roman alphabet; they had not, however, been specifically devised for geographers and it was open to nations to suggest amendments to them.

Fourth session - 13 September

Continuing the discussion on the ISO system, the Chairman noted that the latter's practice of seeking the agreement of the "donor" country (i.e. that using the script out of which names were being transcribed) was at variance with the principle adopted by the Committee according to which the decisive factor was the preference of the receiver. He pointed out that the ISO system for Hebrew had too many diacritics to be suitable for cartographic purposes. The delegate of Belgium pointed out that the International Committee on Onomastic Sciences had proposed the setting up of a committee of experts to devise a uniform system of transcription into the Roman alphabet. The delegate of the USSR drew attention to the danger of

multiplying systems and pointed out that the ISO systems provided for trans-
literation only, which distorted the pronunciation in the case of languages
not written phonetically. The delegate of the USA said that the objective
should be to distort names as little as possible in either spelling or
pronunciation.

The delegate of the UK suggested that the problem of reducing the num-
ber of systems could be tackled on a regional basis: the ISO system for
Cyrillic was apparently acceptable to German-speaking countries, while the
UK and USA had reached agreement on a system of their own which had widely
applied. The delegate of Kenya said that the ISO system for Arabic ap-
peared designed to reconcile English and French forms. The delegate of
France pointed out that the report of the Committee of Experts had suggest-
ed that in default of universal agreement among Roman alphabet users,
partial uniformity might be achieved on the basis of systems conforming
respectively to English, French and Spanish writing conventions. In the
case of Arabic names transliterated into French, the sounds which could not
be represented in the French form of the Roman alphabet were denoted by
widely known conventional signs. This was, in practice, a matter for the
country using the Arabic alphabet which wished to publish its names in
romanized form.

The Chairman recalled that the ISO was a non-governmental body and
noted that its recommendations did not command universal acceptance for
cartographic purposes. Alternative proposals had been advanced for the
creation of a single system for international use differing from that of
the ISO, or for systems based on national requirements, or again on agree-
ment between the users respectively of English, French and Spanish, as the
three UN official languages which used the Roman alphabet.

The delegate of the UK said that the practical aspect must be consider-
ed. Tens of thousands of names had been transliterated and used in maps
and gazetteers according to English or French Roman alphabet systems, and
none as yet according to the ISO recommendations. If a new system were
adopted all this work would have to be redone. He explained that while the
UK Permanent Committee on Geographical Names and the US Board on Geographic
Names had agreed between themselves on a system for the transliteration of
Arabic, the PCGN had accepted the French-style Roman alphabet renderings of
names in Tunisia and elsewhere as these were of long standing.

The delegate of Libya said that there should be a uniform system for
all Arab countries based on classical Arabic; he did not regard the ISO
system as satisfactory for geographical purposes. The delegate of the USSR
suggested that the use of English or French Roman alphabet systems for
Arabic and other scripts might be a useful intermediate stage on the way
to complete standardization. Speaking generally, he thought it useful that
each country should indicate fully the basis on which its gazetteers etc.
were compiled.

Upon a suggestion by the delegate of Mexico that a sub-committee might
be set up to draft a compromise system for Arabic, the delegates of Libya
and Lebanon pointed out that not enough Arab countries and organizations
were represented at the Conference for such an attempt to be useful. As

the result of a further suggestion by the delegate of Mexico, a study group
was formed of delegates of Lebanon, Libya, UK, and USA to draft a proposal
to place before Arab League nations with the object of arriving at a single
system of romanization.

Fifth session - 15 September

The Chairman made a summary of the principal stages of agreement reached
by the Conference at its previous sessions.   These were:

1. The problems of transferring from writing system A to writing
    system B were different from those in transferring from writing
    system B to writing system A.

2. In transferring from one writing system to another, the final
    choice of method rested with the receiver language and not the
    donor language.

3. Account should be taken of work already carried out by the donor
    language.

4. In transferring from one writing system to another, preserving
    the original pronunciation is not a feasible aim.

5. The transference from one writing system to another can be either
    by a direct transposition of one letter for another or by render-
    ing the sounds in their appropriate equivalent in another writing
    system. In either event the method of carrying out the transfer
    would be determined by the receiver language.

6. The varying pronunciations of the letters of the Roman alphabet
    made agreement on a single international system an extremely
    difficult problem.

7. In drawing up romanization systems, efforts should be made to
    limit the number of diacritical signs and modified letters to the
    minimum possible.

8. In devising modified letters the modification should not be so
    great as to make recognition or association with unmodified
    letters difficult. Maximum publicity should be given to the
    phonetic value of the letters so modified.

9. For the recording of unwritten languages the methods to be
    recommended in order of preference were:

    (a) recording in a phonemic writing system,
    (b) recording in the alphabet of the International Phonetic
         Association
         (i) by a narrow phonetic transcription for the scientific
              recording of the language if possible.
         (ii) by a broad phonetic rendering for the purpose of
              recording the geographical name.

(c) recording in the alphabet of a related language for which an alphabet exists,
(d) recording directly into a conventional alphabet:
    (i) by an informed recorder,
    (ii) by an uninformed recorder.

10. IPA symbols will not be used for the writing of geographical names on published maps. In gazetteers the IPA symbols would be a valuable addition to the geographical name to give an indication of pronunciation.

11. The difference between the ISO system for the writing of Cyrillic and the Russian Academy system have been noted and discussed.

12. The question of how much regard should be paid to work already carried out and published in the form of maps, gazetteers, etc., has been discussed but no firm conclusions have been reached.

13. A Working Party has been formed to study how best to bring about a single Roman alphabet system for the writing of Arabic.

14. The Group of Experts in their report as well as some delegates to the present Conference had pointed out that if a final international standardization in one system was not possible an intermediate measure may be to propose romanization in terms of two or possibly more Roman alphabet languages.

Since there were no objections to the principles enumerated above they were accepted as the working basis for Committee III at this and subsequent sessions.

The Chairman moved to the next item on the agenda which was the possible adoption of a standard system for the writing of geographical names in Iran. Discussion ensued on whether the principle behind the adoption of this system conflicted with the donor-receiver concept. Delegates taking part in the discussion were Switzerland, USA, Austria and the United Kingdom. Both the USA and the UK drew attention to the existence of a large amount of mapping carried out in the system.

Thailand and Ethiopia also proposed the acceptance of their romanization systems for international use. Considerable discussion took place on the donor-receiver concept. Those taking part were Cameroon, USSR, Hungary, Austria, Germany, Ethiopia and Poland. Among the points made by the delegates of Hungary, Bulgaria, Poland and Germany was the proposal to adopt the Russian Academy System for the transference of Russian into Cyrillic.

The delegate of Kenya suggested multilateral discussions with Arabic-speaking nations to try to reach a satisfactory romanization system.

The delegate of the Lebanon supported the adoption of the system for the transliteration of geographical names in Iran, provided it did not commit the Arab countries as a whole. The delegate of Libya, supported the delegate of the Lebanon. The Chairman assured the delegates of the Lebanon

71

and Libya that no such commitment was implied and proposed that questions on such matters should be referred to the United Nations Permanent Committee of Experts if, in due course, it was formed.

Sixth session - 19 September

The Chairman opened the discussion on the draft resolution circulated at the previous session and signed by the delegates of Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Kenya, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and a number of other countries. He recalled that while the ultimate objective was the achievement of a single system for transference into the Roman alphabet, the experts' report had envisaged the possibility of separate English, French and Spanish systems as an intermediate stage. He was not clear as to the meaning of the expression "for international use" in the draft resolution and suggested that this should be left aside for the time being. He drew attention to the relevance of paragraph 11, sub-paragraphs (f) and (g), and paragraph 12 of E/Conf.53/L.1.

The delegate of Norway said that he did not understand the draft resolution as calling for the immediate adoption of a Roman alphabet system but merely for efforts in that direction. The delegate of Spain said that the Spanish form of the Roman alphabet was adequate to most of the sounds expressed by the Cyrillic script. The delegate of Austria said that for the past hundred years or so scholars in central and eastern Europe had used a system for Cyrillic based on the Czech or Croat forms of the Roman alphabet; this was close to the ISO system and to that used by the Soviet Union and the eastern European countries in their sheets of the International Map of the World on the scale of 1:2,500,000. Moreover, the ISO had at the beginning of 1967 issued a revised version of their system which was even closer to the Soviet one. At the same time this revised system included a set of permitted variants which went far to meet the point of view of English users of the Roman alphabet.

The delegate of the USA said that there was no time to discuss the details of all existing systems in the present Committee. They should be compared thoroughly and without prejudice, and he pointed out that the ISO system for Cyrillic had been applied on a minute scale by comparison with the BGN/PCGN system, which during the past 24 years had been applied to hundreds of thousands of geographical names.

The delegate of Norway said that the Committee should not concentrate too exclusively on work already done but should look to the future. The delegate of Spain said that his country would find it hard to give up conventional names, but he agreed that the ultimate aim was to reduce the UN linguistic "pentagon" to a triangle and then to a circle.

The delegate of Austria expressed the view that the same system should be used for purposes of documentation as for map-making. Each country was entitled to preserve its own system for national use alongside the international one which it was hoped to create. Questioned by the delegate of the USA, he said that he did not regard the BGN/PCGN system as suitable for international use because it was based too exclusively on English usage. The Chairman pointed out that the ISO system could only be regarded as

relatively acceptable to English users if the set of variants already referred to were adopted.

The delegate of the USSR expressed the view, which the Chairman endorsed, that consultation between experts on a regional basis would be useful. The delegate of the UK pointed out a further source of divergence between the ISO and the Soviet system in that the former provided for direct transliteration from Ukrainian and White Russian into the Roman alphabet, whereas in the Soviet Union names from these languages were rendered in Great Russian spelling which was then transferred into the Roman alphabet. It was also argued on behalf of the UK that standardization should not do violence to the linguistic habits of the speakers of the major world languages.

Seventh session - 20 September

Discussion continued on the draft resolution concerning a single romanization system for non-Roman scripts. Amendments were proposed by the delegates of the USA and the UK. The latter expressed the view that the revised draft still did not take sufficient account of the diversity of forms of the Roman alphabet and that the wording should be made less categorical to avoid raising false hopes of uniformity. The delegate of Norway said that on the other hand it was necessary to give an encouraging account of the achievements of the Conference. The delegate of the USSR said that a single Roman alphabet system was a remote ideal and that in the meantime adaptations should be proposed for each Roman alphabet country. The observer of the International Hydrographic Bureau said that his authorities had for some years advocated the establishment of uniform romanization systems /document E/Conf.53/L.54/. The delegate of the USA pointed out that geographical names were not the exclusive property of the experts but belonged to the world public, and that the Conference must keep in touch with the latter if its work was not to be divorced from reality. The delegate of the Netherlands undertook to amend the draft resolution further in the light of the discussion.

The Committee discussed draft resolution on (a), the retention, in maps, of accents and similar marks which were necessary for the exact reading of names in French, Spanish, Portugese and other languages, and (b) transcription from classical Arabic.

The Committee then considered the proposal by Iran that the system used officially for the romanization of geographical names in Iran be adopted as the standard system of transliteration. The proposal was accepted without opposition.

The Committee then accepted unanimously as the standard system for the writing of geographical names of Thailand, the system described in E/Conf.53/L.20.

The delegate of China made a statement on the method of romanization applied in his country on the basis of the Wade-Giles system. The delegate of Hungary suggested that consideration be also given to the system devised in mainland China. The delegate of China replied that the mainland authorities had ceased to use this and were making increasing use of the modified

Wade-Giles system. He further reminded delegates that his Government represented China at the United Nations and was a permanent member of the Security Council. At the suggestion of the delegate of Romania, supported by those of Hungary, Poland and Austria, it was agreed to refer this matter to the proposed UN Permanent Commission on Geographical Names.

The delegate of Liberia raised the question of the romanization of African syllabic languages and the correct pronunciation of African names. The Chairman invited the delegates of the States immediately concerned to formulate a draft resolution.

The Chairman commended to the attention of the Committee a draft resolution by the representative of the Holy See on the need for research- ers and others concerned to respect the historical, cultural and other associations of place-names.

Eighth session - 21 September

The Chairman presented the Draft Report of Committee III, and asked for such corrections and amendments from delegates as might be appropriate.

The Chairman said that he had received from the Austrian delegate and others memoranda expressing views on matters which had been discussed in the course of the Conference. As there was no time for further discussion of these in the present session he requested that they be addressed to him as Chairman of Committee III and he would forward them to the United Nations Permanent Commission of Experts on Geographical Names for action.

The Chairman referred to the two alternative definitions of the words "transliteration" and "transcription" which had been circulated,* and proposed reference of both definitions to the United Nations Permanent Commission of Experts on Geographical Names for final decision. This was agreed. The delegate of Mexico reminded the Conference that in Spanish the meanings of the two words were exactly transposed as compared to English. The Chairman undertook to bring this point and the views of other delegates to the United Nations Permanent Commission of Experts on Geographical Names.

The Chairman drew attention to the proposed recommendation submitted by the delegate of the Holy See and introduced as a topic at the previous session. He suggested that the matter came within the sphere of Committee I. The Chairman of Committee I concurred. It was agreed that the Holy See would submit a memorandum to the Chairman of Committee I for transmission to the United Nations Permanent Commission of Experts on Geographical Names if the Recommendation on the Office Treatment of Geographical Names did not cover the points in question.

The two separate wordings of a resolution on the romanization of Thai were discussed and a single text approved.

---

*See Annex.

74

Draft resolutions 1 and 2 were accepted without change.

The two separate wordings of a resolution on the romanization of Persian were discussed and a single text approved.

Resolution 4 was adopted without amendment.

The applicability of the resolution to Greek was accepted in principle by the delegation of Cyprus but in the absence of a delegation from Greece the question was referred to the United Nations Permanent Commission of Experts on Geographical Names.

A revised text of resolution 5 on the romanization of names in Ethiopia was accepted.

Resolution 8 was accepted without amendment, subject to possible editorial improvement by the United Nations Permanent Commission of Experts on Geographical Names in due course.

A recommendation on the question of the romanization of Chinese was approved.

The third draft of the recommendation concerning item 11 was approved with one minor addition.

The draft resolution on the problem of unwritten languages in Africa submitted by the delegate of Liberia was approved.

The resolutions appear in document E/Conf.53/2/Add. 3.

The Chairman regretted that there would not now be time to discuss a recommendation proposed by the delegate of Cambodia on the romanization of Cambodian geographical names but he would send it to the United Nations Permanent Commission of Experts on Geographical Names for action.

The Chairman thanked delegations for their participation in the work of Committee III and the session was closed.

ANNEX TO REPORT OF COMMITTEE III

DEFINITION A

TRANSLITERATION is a method of transferring names from one language to another, in which a particular letter or other graphic sign in the original language is regularly represented by one and the same letter or combination of letters in the second language. Unlike transcription, it is usually reversible.

TRANSCRIPTION is a method of transferring names from one language to another, in which the sound of each individual name is represented as accurately as possible in the script of the second language.

DEFINITION B

TRANSLITERATION and *TRANSCRIPTION* are means of transferring names from one language into another.

TRANSLITERATION uses the letters of a conventional phonetic system and is reversible; *TRANSCRIPTION* uses those of the second language according- ' ing to their customary phonetic value.

PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION III -- SYSTEMES D'ECRITURE

Première séance, 6 septembre

Le Président de la Commission III, M. H.A.G. Lewis (Royaume-Uni) a ouvert la séance en passant en revue la liste des documents à examiner, et il a proposé de distinguer quatre catégories de noms selon que leur transcription se fait à partir:

    i)   d'idéogrammes;
    ii)   d'un système d'écriture syllabique;
    iii)   de l'alphabet latin;
    iv)   d'un alphabet non latin.

Le Président a appelé l'attention sur le rapport du Groupe d'experts (E/Conf.53/L.1 et L.2), et plus spécialement sur la recommandation VII figurant dans le second de ces documents. Le Président a demandé aux représentants de noter que cette recommandation traitait à la fois de la normalisation nationale et de la transcription de noms géographiques d'un système d'écriture dans un autre, et qu'elle devait, en conséquence, être examinée par la Commission I et la Commission III. En ce qui la concernait, la Commission III discuterait les questions de translittération et de transcription; les autres problèmes serait renvoyés, le cas échéant, à la Commission I.M. Lambert, Président de la Commission I, a accepté que les deux Commissions coordonnent leurs activités.

Le représentant des Etats-Unis d'Amérique a appelé l'attention sur les documents E/Conf.53/L.26 et Add. 1, qu'il convenait d'étudier conjointement. On a reconnu que les principes régissant la transcription d'un nom à partir d'un système d'écriture donné vers un autre n'étaient pas forcément les mêmes que pour la transcription en sens inverse. Le représentant de la Norvège a appelé l'attention sur les difficultés résultant, dans de nombreux pays, de ce que les lettres de l'alphabet latin n'on pas partout la même

valeur phonétique, et il a proposé de mettre au point, pour l'usage interna-
tional, un système utilisant l'alphabet latin complété par un nombre aussi
restreint que possible de signes spéciaux. Le représentant de la République
fédérale d'Allemagne a proposé que les nations ayant un système d'écriture
en caractères non latins adoptent un système officiel de translittération et
que pour une longue donnée, un seul système soit retenu. Les représentants
de l'Espagne, du Mexique, de l'Allemagne et de l'Autriche ont émis des doutes
sur l'exactitude de la définition des mots "transcription" et "translittéra-
tion" qui est donnée dans le document E/Conf.53/L.2. Un groupe de travail
chargé de mettre au point de nouvelles définitions a été constitué, mais il
a été convenu que les définitions données dans le document E/Conf.53/L.2
seraient retenues provisoirement par la Commission III pour ses travaux.

Le représentant de l'URSS a appelé l'attention sur les problèmes parti-
culiers que pose la transcription de noms dans l'alphabet cyrillique à
partir de l'alphabet latin. Le Président a proposé d'accepter un principe
directeur supplémentaire selon lequel, pour déterminer la méthode de trans-
cription des noms dans un système d'écriture donné a partir d'un autre
système, le facteur décisif devait être la préférence des utilisateurs du
système vers lequel se faisait la transcription.

Deuxième séance, 6 septembre

Le Président a annoncé que le Groupe de travail sur la recommandation VII se
composerait des représentants de l'Iran (convocateur), des Etats-Unis
d'Amérique, du Royaume-Uni, de l'URSS, de la France, de la Libye et de
l'Ethiopie.

Le représentant du Ghana a dit qu'il était en mesure d'accepter la re-
commandation VII et que les nombreuses langues parlées dans son pays pour-
raient être transcrites dans l'alphabet latin complété par quelques lettres
spéciales. Le représentant de la Norvège a dit que dans son pays, les noms
lapons étaient traités de façon analogue. Le Président a recommandé que l'on
évite d'employer des lettres spéciales de forme peu familière. Le repré-
sentant de l'URSS a dit que dans son pays, la pratique était d'écrire les
langues non russes dans l'alphabet cyrillique sans employer de lettres ou
de signes spéciaux, même si cette méthode entraînait parfois une certaine
perte de précision au point de vue phonétique. Les noms géographiques ne
devraient pas être écrits différemment des mots ordinaires. Les représen-
tants des Etats-Unis et du Kénya ont eux aussi désapprouvé l'utilisation de
signes non familiers.

Le représentant du Royaume-Uni a souligné qu'il était possible de dis-
tinguer, pour un nom donné, une forme servant "a des fins de référence",
utilisée dans la pratique, et une forme servant "à des fins d'information",
donnant une précision plus grande. Le représentant des Etats-Unis d'Amérique
a préféré pour sa part qu'on s'en tienne à une seule transcription.

Le représentant de l'URSS a dit qu'étant donné les valeurs différentes
données aux lettres de l'alphabet latin dans les différents pays qui utili-
sent cet alphabet, son pays avait adopté, pour la version anglaise de son
atlas mondial, un système de transcription des noms en caractères cyrilli-
ques semblable à celui de l'Organisation internationale de normalisation
(ISO), mais avec un certain nombre de modifications.

Sur l'invitation du Président, le représentant de l'Organisation inter-
nationale de normalisation a expliqué que les systèmes adoptés par ladite
organisation pour la translittération à partir des différents systèmes
d'écriture ont été mis au point par accord entre les organisations nationales
de normalisation et que certains de ces systèmes étaient actuellement en
cours de modification. Le représentant de la France et le représentant du
Royaume-Uni ont précisé que les organisations s'occupant de la normalisation
dans leurs deux pays étaient des organismes privés et non des organismes
officiels.

Troisième séance, 13 septembre

Le Président a invité le représentant de l'Autriche à se joindre au Groupe
de travail créé à la séance précédente. Il a proposé d'étudier la question
de la graphie des noms empruntés à des langues non écrites et des noms des
régions multilingues. Le représentant de l'URSS a dit que dans son pays,
pour transcrire les noms empruntés à des langues peu connues ou non écrites,
on se servait de signes diacritiques ou de l'alphabet de l'Association pho-
nétique internationale (API). Les représentants du Ghana et du Libéria se
sont eux aussi prononcés en faveur de cet alphabet, mais le représentant du
Kénya a dit qu'il est parfois difficile de trouver des transcripteurs qui le
connaissent. Le représentant du Cameroun a jugé qu'il valait mieux utiliser
des transcriptions anglaises ou françaises, même approximatives, que d'atten-
dre que des linguistiques spécialisés aient mis au point des systèmes plus
parfaits. Le représentant des Etats-Unis a déclaré préférer la transposition
directe de la langue non écrite vers celle qui est utilisée sur la carte.
Le représentant de la Norvège a dit que ce qui importe avant tout c'est que
le nom, une fois transcrit, puisse être reconnu par la population locale, et
que les personnes qui ne le connaissaient pas auparavant puissent le pronon-
cer de façon correcte. L'enregistrement sur bande magnétique a été utile
dans le cas des noms lapons. Le Président a déclaré que, de l'avis général,
l'alphabet phonétique international pouvait rendre des services, mais que ce
n'était pas la seule méthode praticable: l'alphabet d'une langue écrite
apparentée pouvait servir également. Le représentant des Etats-Unis a fait
observer que des magnétophones d'un format convenant pour les opérations sur
le terrain pourraient n'être pas suffisamment fidèles. Le Président a ajouté
qu'une autre difficulté venait de ce que la prononciation de certains noms
change en cas de déclinaison.

Revenant à la question du traitement des langues dont il existe déjà une
représentation graphique, le Président a demandé s'il était préférable de
recourir à la transcription ou à la translittération. Le représentant des
Etats-Unis a déclaré que cela dépendait de la question de savoir si la graphie
à partir de laquelle les noms étaient transposés était phonétique ou non:
dans le premier cas, la translittération était tout indiquée.

Le représentant de l'Autriche a suggéré que la Conférence accepte les
systèmes de translittération mis au point par l'Organisation internationale
de normalisation, sous réserve de modifications mineures si besoin était.
Le Président, appuyé par le représentant des Etats-Unis, a dit qu'à son avis
la Commission devait étudier avec soin tous les systèmes existants et formuler
des recommandations adéquates dans le cadre de l'Organisation des Nations
Unies. Le représentant du Royaume-Uni a déclaré que les systèmes de l'ISO
n'étaient pas essentiellement conçus pour des géographes, mais à des fins de

documentation, de bibliographie, etc., et que les adopter reviendrait simple-
ment à ajouter un système de plus à tous ceux qui ont déjà été proposés
pour chaque langue ou système d'écriture. Le représentant de la République
fédérale d'Allemagne a appuyé la proposition de l'Autriche. Le représentant
de l'ISO s'est engagé à faire distribuer à la Commission des copies des
systèmes mis au point par cette organisation pour les alphabets cyrillique,
arabe et hébraïque. Il a expliqué que ces systèmes ont recueilli une large
mesure d'accord international parmi les organismes membres de l'ISO, au
nombre desquels figurent de nombreux utilisateurs de l'alphabet latin;
cependant, ces systèmes n'ont pas été établis à l'intention spéciale des
géographes et il est loisible aux pays intéressés de suggérer des modifica-
tions à leur sujet.

Quatrième séance, 13 septembre

Poursuivant le débat relatif au système de l'ISO, le Président a fait observer
que la pratique de cette organisation consistant à rechercher l'accord du
pays qui utilise le système d'écriture à transcrire est en désaccord avec le
principe adopté par la Commission et selon lequel le facteur décisif est la
préférence du pays vers le système duquel la transcription s'effectue. Il a
souligné que le système utilisé par l'ISO pour l'hébreu a trop de signes
diacritiques pour convenir au travail cartographique. Le représentant de là
Belgique a fait observer que le Comité international des sciences onomastiques
avait proposé de créer un comité d'experts chargé de mettre au point un
système uniforme de transcription vers l'alphabet latin. Le représentant de
l'URSS a appelé l'attention sur le danger qu'il y avait à multiplier les
systèmes et a fait observer que les systèmes de l'ISO n'étaient conçus que
pour la translittération, qui déforme la prononciation dans le cas de langues
dont l'écriture n'est pas phonétique. Le représentant des Etats-Unis a
déclaré que l'objectif devait être de déformer les noms aussi peu que possible,
qu'il s'agisse de l'orthographe ou de la prononciation.

Le représentant du Royaume-Uni a suggéré d'aborder le problème de la ré-
duction du nombre des systèmes sur une base régionale: le système mis au
point par l'ISO pour l'alphabet cyrillique est apparemment acceptable pour
les pays de langue allemande, tandis que le Royaume-Uni et les Etats-Unis se
sont mis d'accord sur un système qui leur est propre et qui a été largement
utilisé. Le représentant du Kénya a dit que le système arrêté par l'ISO
pour l'arabe semblait conçu pour concilier les formules anglaise et française.
Le représentant de la France a rappelé que le rapport du Comité d'experts
suggérait qu'à défaut d'accord universel entre les utilisateurs de l'alphabet
latin, une uniformité partielle soit éventuellement obtenue à partir de
systèmes respectivement conformes aux conventions orthographiques anglaises,
françaises et espagnoles. Dans le cas de noms arabes translittérés en
français, les sons qui ne peuvent pas être représentés dans la variante fran-
çaise de l'alphabet latin sont désignés par des signes conventionnels très
connus. La question regarde en pratique le pays de langue arabe qui souhaite
transposer ses noms sous une forme latinisée.

Le Président a rappelé que l'ISO était une organisation non gouvernemen-
tale et il a fait observer que ses recommandations n'étaient pas universelle-
ment acceptées par les cartographes. Des propositions de rechange devaient
être formulées en vue de la mise au point d'un système unique de portée inter-
nationale, différent de celui de l'ISO, ou en faveur de systèmes fondés sur

les besoins nationaux, ou encore sur un accord entre les utilisateurs de l'anglais, de l'espagnol et du français respectivement, c'est-à-dire des trois langues officielles des Nations Unies employant l'alphabet latin.

Le représentant du Royaume-Uni a rappelé que l'aspect pratique de la question devait entrer en ligne de compte. Des dizaines de milliers de noms ont été translittérés et utilisés sous forme latinisée, selon les systèmes anglais ou français, tandis qu'aucun ne l'a encore été selon les recommandations de l'ISO. Si l'on adoptait un autre système, tout ce travail serait à refaire. Il a ajouté que le Permanent Committee on Geographical Names du Royaume-Uni et le Board on Geographical Names des Etats-Unis se sont mis d'accord sur un système de translittération de l'arabe, mais que le PCGN a néanmoins accepté le système français de transposition dans l'alphabet latin pour les noms tunisiens et autres, la représentation française s'étant imposée du fait de son ancienneté.

Le représentant de la Libye a dit qu'il devrait y avoir pour tous les pays arabes un système uniforme fondé sur l'arabe classique, et qu'il ne considérait pas le système de l'ISO comme satisfaisant à des fins géographiques. Le représentant de l'URSS a émis l'opinion que l'emploi des formules anglaise ou française de latinisation pour le système d'écriture arabe et pour certains autres pourrait constituer un stade intermédiaire utile sur la voie de la normalisation complète. De façon générale, il lui semblait indiqué que les divers pays spécifient nettement le système sur lequel ils se sont fondés pour établir leurs nomenclatures etc.

Le représentant du Mexique ayant émis l'opinion qu'un sous-comité pourrait être créé pour élaborer un système de compromis pour l'arabe, les représentants de la Libye et du Liban ont fait observer que le nombre de pays et d'organisations arabes représentés à la Conférence n'était pas suffisant pour qu'une telle tentative ait une utilité. A la suite d'une nouvelle suggestion de la délégation du Mexique, un groupe d'étude composé des représentants des Etats-Unis, du Liban, de la Libye et du Royaume-Uni a été constitué pour élaborer une proposition qui serait soumise aux pays de la Ligue arabe en vue d'aboutir à un système unique de latinisation.

Cinquième séance, 15 septembre

Le Président a résumé les principaux points sur lesquels la Commission était parvenue à un accord à ses séances précédentes, à savoir que:

1. Les problèmes posés par le passage d'un système d'écriture A à un système d'écriture B ne sont pas les mêmes que pour le passage du système d'écriture B au système d'écriture A.

2. Pour passer d'un système d'écriture à un autre, le choix de la méthode revient finalement à la langue dans laquelle on transcrit (langue finale) et non à la langue qui est transcrite (langue initiale).

3. Il devrait être tenu compte du travail auquel le nom employé dans la langue qui est transcrite a déjà donné lieu.

4.   En passant d'un système d'écriture à un autre il n'est pas possible de chercher dans tous les cas à préserver la prononciation originale.

5.   Le passage d'un système d'écriture à un autre peut se faire soit en transposant directement lettre par lettre soit en traduisant les sons au moyen des lettres donnant l'équivalent dans un autre système d'écriture. En tout état de cause, la méthode retenue est déterminée par la langue dans laquelle on transcrit.

6.   Les différentes prononciations des lettres de l'alphabet latin rendent très difficile un accord sur un système international unique.

7.   En élaborant des systèmes de latinisation, il faudrait s'efforcer de limiter à un minimum le nombre des signes diacritiques et des lettres modifiées.

8.   Lorsqu'on utilise des lettres modifiées, la modification ne devrait pas être telle qu'il soit difficile de les reconnaître ou de les associer aux lettres courantes. Il faudrait donner la plus large publicité à la valeur phonétiques des lettres ainsi modifiées.

9.   Les méthodes recommandées pour transcrire les langues non écrites sont, par ordre de préférence:

   a) Enregistrement au moyen d'un système de notation phonémiques;

   b) enregistrement au moyen de l'alphabet de l'Association phonétique internationale.

      i)   par une transcription phonétique précise qui donne, si possible, les caractéristiques exactes de la langue;

      ii) par une transcription phonétique plus lâche du nom géographique;

   c) enregistrement dans l'alphabet d'une langue apparentée qui en possède un;

   d) transcription directe dans un alphabet conventionnel;

      i)   par une personne qui connaît la langue,

      ii) par une personne qui ne la connaît pas.

10. Les symboles de l'API ne seront pas employés pour inscrire les noms géographiques sur les cartes publiées. Dans les nomenclatures, les symboles de l'API ajoutés aux noms géographiques seraient utiles pour indiquer la prononciation.

11. La différence entre le système d'écriture cyrillique de l'ISO et celui de l'Académie russe a été notée et a fait l'objet d'un échange de vues.

12. La question de savoir quelle valeur attacher aux travaux déjà effectués et publiés sous forme de cartes, nomenclatures, etc. a fait l'objet d'un débat mais il n'en est sorti aucune conclusion précise.

13. Un Groupe de travail a été crée pour étudier la meilleure façon d'uniformiser le système de latinisation des caractères arabes.

14. Le Groupe d'experts a signalé dans son rapport, comme aussi certains représentants à la présente Conférence, que s'il était impossible de parvenir à une normalisation internationale définitive fondée sur une seul système, on pouvait cependant envisager une mesure intermédiaire qui consisterait à effectuer la latinisation sur la base de deux ou peut-être plusieurs langues employant l'alphabet latin.

Les principes énumérés ci-dessus n'ayant pas soulevé d'objections, ils ont été acceptés comme base de travail pour cette séance et les séances ultérieures de la Commission III.

Le Président a proposé d'examiner le point suivant de l'ordre du jour, qui avait trait à l'adoption éventuelle d'un système type pour l'écriture des noms géographiques en Iran. Une discussion s'est engagée sur la question de savoir si le principe invoqué en vue de l'adoption de ce système n'était pas en contradiction avec le principe relatif au rôle que joue la langue finale par rapport à la langue initiale. Les représentants de l'Autriche, des Etats-Unis d'Amérique, du Royaume-Uni et de la Suisse sont intervenus dans le débat. Les représentants des Etats-Unis d'Amérique et du Royaume-Uni ont tous deux appelé l'attention sur l'existence de très nombreuses cartes établies selon ce système.

Les représentants del'Ethiopie et de la Thailande ont aussi proposé que leurs systèmes de latinisation soient acceptés aux fins d'usage international. Un très large débat s'est engagé sur le principe relatif au rôle que joue la langue finale par rapport à la langue initiale. Sont intervenus dans le débat les représentants du Cameroun, de l'URSS, de la Hongrie, de l'Autriche, de la République fédérale d'Allemagne, de l'Ethiopie et de la Pologne. Des interventions des représentants de la Hongrie, de la Bulgarie, de la Pologne et de la République fédérale d'Allemagne, il convient de retenir la proposition tendant à adopter le système de l'Académie russe pour transposer le russe en caractères latins.

Le représentant du Kenya a suggéré que des discussions multilatérales se tiennent avec les pays de langue arabe pour tenter de parvenir à un· système satisfaisant de latinisation.

Le représentant du Liban s'est déclaré favorable à l'adoption du système de translittération des noms géographiques employé en Iran, sous réserve qu'il n'engage pas l'ensemble des pays arabes. Le représentant de la Libye a adopté la même position. Le Président a donné l'assurance aux représentants du Liban et de la Libye qu'il n'était pas question de prendre un tel engagement, et il a proposé de renvoyer ces questions à la Commission permanente des Nations Unies si elle vient à être crée.

Le Président a ouvert le débat sur le projet de résolution distribué à la séance précédente qui était signé par les représentants de l'Autriche, du Danemark, de la Finlande, de la Hongrie, du Kenya, du Luxembourg, de la Norvège, des Pays-Bas, de la République fédérale d'Allemagne, de la Suède, de la Suisse et d'un certain nombre d'autres pays. Il a rappelé que si le but final était d'élaborer un système unique de transcription en caractère latins, le rapport des experts envisageait cependant la possibilité de se limiter d'abord à trois systèmes distincts, anglais, français et espagnol, à titre d'étape intermédiaire. Il n'était pas bien sûr du sens qu'il fallait donner à l'expression "à des fins internationales" dans le projet de résolution, et il a suggéré de laisser provisoirement ce point de côté. Il a appelé l'attention sur le paragraphe 11, alinéas f) et g), et le paragraphe 12 du document E/Conf.53/L.1, qui se rapportent à ces questions.

Le représentant de la Norvège a dit qu'à son avis le projet de résolution ne demandait pas l'adoption immédiate d'un système fondé sur l'alphabet latin, mais simplement que des efforts soient faits dans ce sens. Le représentant de l'Espagne a estimé que la forme espagnole de l'alphabet latin convenait pour transcrire la plupart des sons exprimés par la graphie cyrillique. Le représentant de l'Autriche a dit que depuis une centaine d'années environ les érudits d'Europe centrale et orientale utilisaient pour le cyrillique un système fondé sur les formes tchèque ou croate de l'alphabet latin; ce système ressemblait fort au système de l'ISO et à celui qu'emploient l'Union soviétique et les pays d'Europe orientale dans les feuilles de la Carte internationale du monde au 1/2.500.000 qu'ils publient. En outre, l'ISO a publié au début de 1967 une version revisée de son système, qui le rapproche encore davantage du système soviétique. Ce système revisé comporte en même temps une série de variantes permises qui donnent presque entièrement satisfaction aux utilisateurs anglais de l'alphabet latin.

Le représentant des Etats-Unis d'Amérique a souligné que la Commission n'avait pas le temps de discuter des détails de tous les systèmes existants. Il faudrait les comparer d'une manière approfondie et sans préjugés; par ailleurs, le système arrêté par l'ISO pour le cyrillique a été appliqué sur une très petite échelle à côté du système BGN/PCGN qui depuis 24 ans a servi pour des centaines de milliers de noms géographiques.

Le représentant de la Norvège a estimé que la Commission ne devait pas trop s'attacher à ce qui a été fait dans le passé mais devait se tourner vers l'avenir. Le représentant de l'Espagne a dit que son pays aurait du mal à abandonner des noms consacrés, mais il a reconnu que le but final était de ramener, à un triangle, et ensuite à un cercle, le "pentagone" linguistique des Nations Unies.

Le représentant de l'Autriche a exprimé l'avis que l'on devrait utiliser le même système pour la documentation que pour la cartographie. Chaque pays est en droit de préserver son système propre pour l'utiliser sur le plan national en même temps que le système international que l'on espère créer. Interrogé par le représentant des Etats-Unis d'Amérique, il a dit que le système BGN/PCGN ne convient pas, à son avis, à des fins internationales parce qu'il est trop exclusivement fondé sur l'usage anglais. Le Président a souligné que le système de l'ISO ne pourrait être considéré que comme

relativement acceptable pour les utilisateurs anglais si l'on adoptait la
série de variantes dont il a été question.

Le représentant de l'URSS, appuyé par le Président, a exprimé l'avis
qu'il serait utile que des consultations s'engagent sur une base régionale
entre experts. Le représentant du Royaume-Uni a signalé une autre source
de divergences entre le système de l'ISO et le système soviétique, à savoir
que le premier système donne une translittération directe de l'ukrainien et
du biélorusse en caractères latins, tandis qu'en Union soviétique les noms
de ces langues sont transposés d'abord en russe, puis en caractères latins.
Il a été également soutenu, au nom du Royaume-Uni, que la normalisation ne
devrait pas heurter les habitudes linguistiques de ceux qui parlent les
principales langues du monde.

Septième séance, 20 septembre

Le débat sur le projet de résolution relatif à l'adoption d'un système unique
de latinisation des noms à partir d'écritures n'utilisant pas l'alphabet latin
s'est poursuivi. Des amendements ont été proposés par les représentants des
Etats-Unis et du Royaume-Uni. Le représentant du Royaume-Uni a été d'avis
que le projet de résolution revisé ne tenait toujours pas suffisamment
compte de la diversité des formes de l'alphabet latin, et que le texte devait
en être rédigé de façon moins catégorique pour éviter de susciter de faux
espoirs en matière d'uniformisation. Le représentant de la Norvège a dit
qu'il était par contre nécessaire de rendre compte en termes encourageants
des résultats atteints par la Conférence. Le représentant de l'URSS a dit
que l'adoption d'un système d'alphabet latin unique représentait un idéal
à longue échéance et qu'en attendant il était nécessaire de proposer des
adaptations pour chaque pays utilisant l'alphabet latin. L'observateur du
Bureau hydrographique international a dit que les responsables dudit Bureau
préconisaient depuis quelques années l'adoption de systèmes uniformes de
latinisation (E/Conf.53/L.54). Le représentant des Etats-Unis d'Amérique a
souligné que les noms géographiques n'étaient pas la propriété exclusive des
experts et qu'ils étaient en quelque sorte du domaine public mondial; la
Conférence devait tenir compte de ce fait si elle ne voulait pas que ses
travaux soient sans rapport avec la réalité. Le représentant des Pays-Bas
s'est engagé à apporter au projet de résolution de nouveaux amendements qui
tiendraient compte des vues exprimées.

La Commission a examiné les projets de résolution concernant: a) le
maintien, dans les cartes, des accents et signes analogues nécessaires à la
lecture exacte des noms français, espagnols, portugais et autres; b) la
transcription de noms à partir de l'arabe classique.

La Commission a ensuite examiné la proposition du représentant de l'Iran
tendant à faire adopter comme système type de latinisation des noms géogra-
phiques de l'Iran le système utilise officiellement dans ce pays. Cette
proposition a été adoptée sans opposition.

La Commission a ensuite adopté, à l'unanimité, en tant que système type
pour l'écriture des noms géographiques de la Thailande, le système exposé
dans le document E/Conf.53/L.20.

Le représentant de la Chine a fait une déclaration sur la méthode de latinisation appliquée dans son pays, méthode qui est fondée sur le système Wade-Giles. Le représetant de la Hongrie a suggéré que l'on prenne également en considération le système mis au point en Chine continentale. Le représentant de la Chine a fait remarquer que les autorités de la Chine continentale avaient cessé d'utiliser ce système et se servaient de plus en plus du système Wade-Giles modifié. Il a en outre rappelé que son gouvernement représentait la Chine aux Nations Unies et était membre permanent du Conseil de sécurité. A la suggestion du représentant de la Roumanie, appuyé par les représentants de la Hongrie, de la Pologne et de l'Autriche, il a été décidé de renvoyer la question devant la Commission permanente des Nations Unies pour les noms géographiques, dont la création était envisagée.

Le représentant du Libéria a soulevé la question de la latinisation des noms appartenant aux langues africaines qui ont un système d'écriture syllabique, ainsi que la question de la prononciation exacte des noms africains. Le Président a invité les représentants des Etats directement intéressés à mettre au point un projet de résolution.

Le Président a porté à l'attention de la Commission un projet de résolution soumis par le représentant du Saint-Siège et faisant ressortir la nécessité, pour les chercheurs et autres savants intéressés, de tenir compte des éléments historiques, culturels et autres qui s'attachent aux noms de lieux.

Huitième séance, 21 septembre

Le Président a présenté le projet de rapport de la Commission III et demandé aux représentants d'indiquer les corrections et amendements à y apporter.

Le Président a dit qu'il avait reçu du représentant de l'Autriche, ainsi que d'autres représentants, des mémoires exprimant les vues de délégations intéressées sur les questions qui n'ont pas été débattues au cours de la Conférence. Etant donné que, faute de temps, il n'était pas possible d'en poursuivre la discussion au cours de la présente session, le Président a demandé que lesdits mémoires lui soient adressés en sa qualité de président de la Commission III, afin qu'il puisse les transmettre pour décision à la Commission permanente d'experts des noms géographiques des Nations Unies.

Le Président, se référant aux deux définitions des mots "translittération" et "transcription" qui avaient été distribuées*, et entre lesquelles la Commission devait choisir, a proposé que la question soit renvoyée à la Commission permanente des noms géographiques des Nations Unies, pour qu'elle tranche en dernier ressort. Cette proposition a été acceptée. Le représentant du Mexique a rappelé à la Conférence qu'en espagnol, la signification des deux mots est exactement l'inverse de l'anglais. Le Président s'est engagé à saisir la Commission permanente de cette question et des points de vue exprimés par d'autres représentants.

Le Président a appelé l'attention sur le projet de recommandation soumis par le représentant du Saint-Siège et présenté comme thème de discussion

---

*Voir annexe.

à la séance précédente. Il a dit qu'à son avis la question était du ressort
de la Commission I. Le Président de la Commission I a partagé cet avis. Il
a été décidé que le Saint-Siège soumettrait un mémoire au Président de la
Commission I, qui le transmettrait à la Commission permanente d'experts si
la recommandation sur le traitement des noms géographiques au bureau ne ré-
glait pas les points en question.

Les deux versions distinctes d'une résolution sur la latinisation des
noms thais ont été examinées, et un texte unique a été approuvé.

Les projets de résolution 1 et 2 ont été adoptés sans changement.

Les deux versions distinctes d'une résolution sur la latinisation des
noms persans ont été discutées, et un texte unique a été approuvé.

La résolution 4 a été adoptée sans amendement.

La délégation de Chypre a reconnu qu'en principe cette résolution était
applicable au grec, mais en l'absence de délégation grecque, la question a
été renvoyée à la Commission permanente d'experts des noms géographiques des
Nations Unies.

Un texte revisé de la résolution 5 sur la latinisation des noms éthio-
piens a été adopté.

La résolution 8 a été adoptée sans amendement, sous réserve que la
rédaction en soit éventuellement améliorée par la Commission permanente
d'experts des noms géographiques des Nations Unies.

Une recommandation relative à la latinisation des noms chinois a été
adoptée.

La troisième version de la recommandation relative au point 11, complétée
sur un point d'importance secondaire, a été adoptée.

Le projet de résolution concernant les problèmes qui se posent pour les
langages non écrits d'Afrique, présenté par le représentant du Libéria, a
été adopté.

Ces résolutions sont publiées sous la cote E/Conf.53/2/Add.3.

Le Président a regretté qu'il soit impossible, faute de temps, d'examiner
une recommandation du représentant du Cambodge concernant la latinisation des
noms géographiques cambodgiens; ce projet de recommandation serait transmis
pour décision à la Commission permanente d'experts des noms géographiques
des Nations Unies.

Le Président a remercié les délégations de leur participation aux
travaux de la Commission III et a déclaré la session close.

DEFINITION A

La *TRANSLITTERATION* est une méthode consistant à transposer les noms d'une langue dans une autre langue en représentant régulièrement une lettre particulière ou tout autre signe graphique de la langue originale par la même lettre ou la même combinaison de lettres dans la deuxième langue. Contrairement à la transcription, elle est généralement réversible.

La *TRANSCRIPTION* est une méthode consistant à transposer les noms d'une langue dans une autre, langue en représentant le son de chaque nom aussi exactement que possible dans la graphie de la deuxième langue.

DEFINITION B

La *TRANSLITTERATION* et la *TRANSCRIPTION* sont des moyens de transposer les noms d'une langue dans une autre langue.

La *TRANSLITTERATION* utilise les lettres d'un système phonétique conventionnel et elle est réversible. La *TRANSCRIPTION* utilise les lettres de la deuxième langue, qui conservent leur valeur phonétique habituelle.

DRAFT REPORT OF COMMITTEE IV - INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

The Committee, chaired by Dr. J.K. Fraser (Canada), held four meetings
during which item 12 of the Conference Agenda was studied.

The Committee considered the following papers submitted to the Con-
ference: E/Conf.53/L.1 and Add.1, E/Conf.53/L.2 (pp. 5-6), E/Conf.53/L.15,
E/Conf.53/L.26 (pp. 3-5), E/Conf.53/L.38(p.51), E/Conf.53/L.42, L.54, L.57
and L.67.

The Agenda sub-items were re-arranged under six headings, as follows:

I.   *Formation of a Permanent Commission on Geographical Names*
II.   *Exchanges of Information and Bibliography*
III.   *Technical Assistance*
IV.   *Regional Meetings*
V.   *Names of Features extending beyond a single sovereignty*
VI.   *Steps towards international standardization.*

I.   *Formation of a Permanent Commission on Geographical Names*

It was agreed that the good work done and momentum attained before and
during the Conference would best be continued and strengthened by the for-
mation of a Permanent Committee within the structure of the United Nations.
The membership and functions of such a Committee were discussed. The
experiences of some national names authorities were considered to be rele-
vant. A Working Group was formed to draft a resolution and supporting
explanatory background paper. Its members were representatives of Canada,
China, Federal Republic of Germany, Iran, Netherlands, USA, USSR and the
IHB observes. It was assisted by the representative of the Secretary-
General, the Executive Secretary, the Deputy Executive Secretary, and the
Chairman of the Conference.

The text of the background paper as finally approved reads as follows:

                    Background Paper in support of resolution
                    on establishment of a Permanent Commission

"The writing of geographical names on maps and other documents has
long been a source of difficulty and confusion and an obstacle to smooth

progress and understanding in many economic, social and scientific activities, both national and international.

1.   Some examples of the problems are:

    (a)   places having different names in different languages - e.g. Jerusalem/El Quds;

    (b)   places having different spellings in different languages: Geneva/Genève/Genf/Ginebra/Ginevra;

    (c)   different methods of transliterating from one alphabet to another- e.g. from Arabic: Wadi el Jabal/Ouadi el Djebel/Ouadi el Gabal;

    (d)   different methods of transcribing ideographic languages (e.g. Chinese) to alphabetic languages;

    (e)   differing methods of rendering names from unwritten languages;

    (f)   the exact extent of named geographical features;

    (g)   variations in the meanings of common geographic terms - e.g. creek may refer to an inlet from the sea or to a small stream far from the sea.

2.   The lack of standardized names has caused difficulty in the work of map makers, statisticians, census takers and others, leading to undue and harmful delay and mistakes. Confusion is caused in the interpretation of legal and administrative documents dealing with such matters as boundaries or areas of jurisdiction.

3.   Nearly a century ago (in 1873) the first meeting of the International Geographical Union noted the problem and passed a resolution that international usage should be based on national standardization. Other resolutions have followed at later meetings of this and other international organizations.

4.   The need for seeking solutions to the problems and moving towards some international standardization was mentioned at United Nations as long ago as 1953; later, resolutions 715A(XXVII) and 929(XXXV) of the Economic and Social Council marked two important steps in recognition which led to the convening of the first world conference devoted exclusively to the subject at Geneva in 1967.

5.   The Conference has carefully and fully considered what the next goals should be and how to achieve them and has embodied its views in a series of resolutions. In order to ensure the implementation of these resolutions and the maintenance of the momentum in international cooperation achieved in this Conference it is necessary to create a United Nations Permanent Commission on Geographical Names.

6.   The Commission should consist of:

    (a)   a Group of Experts on geographical name standardization;

    (b)   a Secretariat

7.   The principal functions of the proposed Commission would be:

    (a)   the collection of information on their work from national and

international bodies dealing with the standardization of geo-
graphical names;

(b) the collection and review of gazetteers, topographical glossaries,
technical instructions on toponymic work, etc.;

(c) the dissemination of information compiled from (a) and (b) to
Member States and Agencies, perhaps by way of periodical bulletins;

(d) consultation with Member States having practical experience of
specific problems (e.g. the application of Automatic Data Pro-
cessing to work on geographical names). Working Groups to include
representatives of such states might be formed to deal with such
matters;

(e) the working-out of principles and methods for solving the various
problems of international standardization (e.g. definitions of
geographic terms, transfers between writing systems, treatment
of names of international geographical features (e.g. oceanic),
national standardization systems);

(f) scientific and technical aid and advice to developing countries
in organizing and operating national names authorities. The
Commission might act as a clearing house for bilateral aid
agreements covering such things as provision of experts, litera-
ture and fellowships;

(g) certain tasks connected with proposed UN or other Regional and
International Conferences.

8. Suitable experts are already available in the national names authori-
ties of several nations and it is proposed that initially an ad hoc Group
of Experts be named by nations willing to provide the services of their
representatives.

9. The permanent Group of Experts should include representatives of each
of the major world linguistic/geographic groups. The final composition of
such groups requires some study which should be the first priority task of
the ad hoc Group of Experts. A suggested grouping is as follows:

Anglo-America	*Romance-language Europe*	*Indian Group*
Latin America		*South-East Asia*
	East-Central and South-East Europe	
UK-Australia-New Zealand		*East Asia*
German & Dutch-speaking countries	*USSR*	*Africa south of the Sahara*
Norden	*South-West Asia other than Arabic*	

10. Countries which consider that they belong to a given region should
agree among themselves as to which country will provide an expert to re-
present the region.

11. It is thought that initially the Group of Experts might meet once a
year. It would be necessary for the travelling expenses of each expert to
be financed by his own organization or government.

12. The existing Cartography Section of the Department of Economic and
Social Affairs of the United Nations has already provided the Secretariat
for this first UN Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names
and all the necessary work preceding this Conference. It is recommended
that this arrangement should continue until, in the light of working ex-
perience, the ad hoc Group of Experts shall advise the UN on the number
and prerequisites of the secretarial staff which might be needed for the
efficient servicing of the UN Permanent Commission on the standardization
of geographical names. At the present stage it is foreseen that the pro-
fessional staff would require a background of geographical training, pre-
ferably combined with specializations in cartography and/or linguistics.
A suitable director would need to possess organizational ability and a
personality suitable for technical discussions.

The draft Resolution was discussed, amended and adopted as Resolution 1
of the Conference.

II. *Exchanges of Information and Bibliography*

Possible methods of collection and distribution of relevant written mater-
ial such as gazetteers, glossaries, maps, technical instructions, profes-
sional papers, reports, etc., were considered. Representatives of Ghana,
Libya, Netherlands, United Kingdom and PAIGH contributed to the discussion.

It was agreed that it was desirable for the Cartography Section of the
United Nations to continue to perform this function until the Permanent
Commission proposed in the Resolution under sub-item I above should be able
to do so.

Attention was drawn to the possibility of existing UN Regional organi-
zations such as ECA and ECAFE being able to act as clearing centres.

Liaison with other international organizations having an interest in
geographical names (such as IHB, IUGG, IGU, ICA, PAIGH, ICOS,etc.) was
considered to be important. The delegate of the Holy See mentioned the
Study Centre of Religious Toponymy of Vatican City directed by Prof.
Imbrighi, which proposes to publish a bulletin containing articles and
bibliographies and which places its present resources at the disposal of
Member States.

The Working Group formed to draft the previous Resolution was also
charged with drafting a Resolution on this sub-item.

The draft Resolution was discussed and adopted as Resolution No. 5
of the Conference.

III. *Technical Assistance*

The Committee agreed, with a minimum of discussion, that the process of
national standardization of geographical names in many developing countries
would benefit from technical aid given by other countries with longer ex-
perience or more resources. The aid might be arranged through bilateral
agreements or given by UN. Countries seeking such aid should make appli-
cation to the United Nations. Aid might take the form of supplying expert

personnel and/or technical documents, or arranging fellowships for training or study of the work of national names authorities.

A Working Group, with members drawn from Ghana, Liberia, Libya, Netherlands, Norway, Romania and Spain was formed to draft a suitable Resolution.

The draft Resolution was discussed and adopted as Resolution 6 of the Conference.

IV. *Regional Meetings*

The Committee was agreed that Regional Meetings were, in principle, desirable, but there was lengthy discussion on how to define a region, in which the principal speakers were the delegates of Ghana, Kenya, Netherlands, United Kingdom, USSR and PAIGH.

Some existing regional organizations were mentioned. UN had ECA in Africa and ECAFE in Asia. PAIGH functioned in America. The German-language countries had a permanent committee on geographical names and the Scandinavian countries had had some meetings. A joint meeting of these two groups and the Dutch language group has been arranged for March 1968 in Copenhagen. The Arab League was cited as a desirable Regional Group.

Division into regions based on writing systems was not thought to be a suitable proposal. Dr. Burrill thought that suitable regions could be defined by the geographical extent of particular problems. However, the consensus of opinion was in favour of division by linguistic/geographic units; the proposed Permanent Commission could study this problem and make proposals.

The Working Group formed for item III drafted a Resolution on this subject. The draft Resolution was discussed and adopted as Resolution 7 of the Conference.

V. *Names of features extending beyond a single sovereignty*

The Committee first considered the particular case of names in the oceans and international waters where maps or charts produced by several different agencies may each show a different name for the same feature. The extent of features may also be understood differently by different authorities, and the generic terms used to describe undersea features are also variable.

The observer from IHB reported that the names on the *General Bathymetric Chart of the Oceans* (GEBCO) series of 24 charts at scale 1:10,000,000 had been examined by the Matsuzaki committee which had recommended standard names (spelt in the French system) for all major features. The recommendations were based on replies from 32 nations out of 64 members of IHB or IAPO to whom the questionnaires had been sent. Dr. Burrill commented that the USA does not convert English or conventional English names into French, as the GEBCO Committee does; in names taken from other languages, the specific part is accepted but an English generic is substituted, e.g. *Gora, Baranov* would become *Baranov Seamount*.

According to the 1958 *Geneva Conventions on the Law of the Sea,* the waters covering the continental shelf from the outer limit of territorial waters (usually 3, 6 or 12 miles from shore) to the 200 metre isobath remain international waters. However, it is not unlikely that any nation exercising its right to engage in commercial exploitation of the natural resources of the continental shelf seaward of its territorial waters will become de facto the creator and custodian of names within the area.

Delegates representing Netherlands, UK, USA, USSR and SCAR contributed to the discussion.

It was agreed that the proposed Permanent Commission should consider work already done by various international bodies such as IHB, IOC and IAPO on the standardization of names in international waters and the preparation of a standard glossary of marine physiography, and take various further steps.

A Working Group, with members drawn from Australia, Norway, UK, USSR and the IHB was formed to draft a suitable Resolution.

The Committee also considered non-oceanic features, the principal speakers being the representatives of Austria, Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Hungary, Mexico, Netherlands, UK, USA and USSR. The Antarctic was mentioned as an area of multiple naming and of uncertain limits of features usually due to delays in publication of maps of newly-explored areas. The members of SCAR were trying to remove duplications. The *River Danube* is a well-known case of multiple naming; it has at least seven different names in different languages. In German usage it is always *Donau,* in English usage *Danube*; but what form should be used by, for example, the UN which has no existing conventional usage?

Dr. Burrill drew attention to paper E/Conf.53/L.75, Resolution 11 of the 1962 *Bonn Conference on the IMW* (Report Vol.1, pp. 105-6) which recommended that names of international features shall be in accordance with the usage of the publishing country. This solves the problem for a national agency which already has a usage, but not for an international or other agency which has not. The use of an international language, such as Esperanto, was not favoured by the Committee, nor was a proposal to number features on the map, referenced to a marginal list of alternative names. Bilingual maps had not been very successful.

It was thought that Regional or Sub-Regional Conferences or Commissions might whenever practicable be able to produce single standard names for international use for features extending beyond a single sovereignty; an international commission might then be able to follow the example of the IHB and produce a standard list of all names on a small-scale world map (1:10,000,000, or 1:5,000,000 or 1:2,500,000). The Chairman suggested that this problem be considered by the proposed Permanent Commission and the Committee so agreed.

The draft Resolution was discussed, amended and adopted as Resolution 8 of the Conference.

VI. Steps towards international standardization

This item was transferred to a plenary session of the whole Conference.

This Report was adopted unanimously by the Committee.

NOTE

The Chairman announced that any communications with the ad hoc Group of Experts should be addressed to:

Cartography Section,
Department of Economic and Social Affairs,
Box 20, United Nations,
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10017

V - RESOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CONFERENCE*

Resulting from the work of the four committees, a series of resolutions and recommendations were adopted by the delegates in plenary session.

One of the most significant resolutions pertains to the establishment of a *Permanent Commission* for the standardization of geographical names. This commission, which would consist of a body of experts and a secretariat, would provide for continuous coordination and liaison among nations to further the work of the Conference. It was also agreed to ask the UN to continue to act as a central agency for geographical names by collecting information and data on procedures and techniques used in the transliteration and transcription of names and disseminating this information among member nations.

The Conference also noted that the lack of standardization of names of *maritime and undersea features* adversely affects the safety of navigation and the exchange of oceanographic data. The problem of features common to or extending across frontiers of two or more countries also drew its attention.

Automatic data processing of information on names was dealt with in a recommendation. The UN was specifically asked for its cooperation in the development of international standards in relation to geographical coding structures and procedural guidelines.

The Conference recommended that technical experts engaged in surveying and mapping work should give due attention to standardization of names, and that individual countries or groups of countries having common interests be encouraged to request, when necessary, assistance in the form of training of personnel, consultants and technical information.

The Conference adopted a series of recommendations on national standardization with a view to establishing in each country a *national authority*, which should formulate, adopt and define the guiding principles and practices it will normally apply in the course of its operations, taking into account such factors as current usage, historical background, treatment of multilingual areas and unwritten languages.

---

*The Resolutions and Recommendations reproduced in this report follow the text presented at the time of the Conference in September, 1967.

It was recommended that each names authority produce appropriate *gazetteers* including *glossaries*. Concerning *writing systems*, the adoption was recommended of certain transliteration systems already in existence, such as the official Thai and Iranian Romanization systems. The delegates considered that the Arabic-speaking countries should provide complete documentation for all geographical names and that these countries should investigate the possibility of agreeing on a single system for the *Romanization of Arabic names* for official use in all Arabic-speaking countries.

The proposed UN Permanent Commission is to study some of the other *transliteration systems* in existence, e.g., that proposed by the geographical names authority of Ethiopia and the present system used by the Republic of China.

RESOLUTION NO. 1

UNITED NATIONS PERMANENT COMMISSION ON GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES

The Conference,

Recognizes the importance of a continuing effort by Member States of the United Nations and members of its specialized agencies and other interested international organizations toward advancing the standardization of geographical names,

Considers the United Nations to have the most appropriate means for providing the facilities for such an effort,

Recommends that a UN Permanent Commission on Geographical Names should be created by the Conference, consisting of a body of experts to provide for continuous co-ordination and liaison among nations to further the standardization of geographical names and to encourage the formation and work of regional groups,

Further recommends that the composition of the UN Permanent Commission on Geographical Names should reflect geographical/linguistic distribution and that the work of this body of experts should be assisted by the services of a secretariat within the United Nations and should meet annually at their governments' expense, starting in 1968,

Requests the Secretary-General to ensure that the United Nations continue as the central agency to follow up the clearing house functions for geographical names by:

(a) collection of information concerning technical procedures and gazetteers;
(b) collection of data on techniques and systems used by countries in the transliteration and transcription of geographical names;
(c) dissemination to all Member States of the United Nations and of its specialized agencies, of all information on the work of the Permanent Commission on Geographical Names, as well as the work

of Member States as reported to the United Nations utilizing where feasible existing United Nations periodicals and other means of communication available.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

SECOND UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON THE STANDARDIZATION OF GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES

The Conference,

Noting the importance of geographical names and the great interest shown on this subject by the numerous participants and the Member States of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies,

Appreciating the work that has been accomplished by the participants to this Conference,

Recognizing the necessity for considering the work of the standardization of geographical names for both national and international usage,

Recommends to the Economic and Social Council that the second United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names be held not later than the last quarter of 1970.

RESOLUTION NO. 3

AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING

The Conference,

Recognizing the rapid advances in automatic data processing and the rapid developments in the field of computer technology,

Considering the value of the application of these technical aids in geographical names for various purposes, for listing of geographical names to get a continuously up-to-date file of approved names, for special kinds of names, or for retrieving names according to special categories or other demands,

Noting that it is desirable for the problem of geographical names to be properly taken into account in the design of electronic equipment and in systems for its use,

Recommends that all Member States already engaged in programmes of automatic data processing or which have been involved in discussions on automatic name data processing be requested to exchange information, for

which purpose it would be useful to submit the reports in the official languages of the United Nations,

Further recommends that names specialists establish and maintain working channels of communications with the equipment designers, and that the results of such communications be circulated promptly to the names authorities in the Member States,

Requests that the United Nations serve as a documentation centre where information and documents with regard to automatic data processing can be collected and distributed,

Further requests that the United Nations help to develop international standards in relation to geographical coding structures and procedural guidelines.

RESOLUTION NO. 4

NATIONAL STANDARDIZATION

The Conference,

Recognizing that the national standardization of geographical names provides economic and practical benefits to individual nations,

Further recognizing that national standardization of geographical names by all nations is an essential preliminary to international standardization,

Requests that the following recommendations on the national standardization of geographical names be reviewed by the proper United Nations authorities,

Further requests the Secretary-General to submit these recommendations for consideration by the Economic and Social Council,

Urges that these recommendations be conveyed to all Member States and interested international organizations for favourable consideration.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4 (a)

National Names Authorities

It is *recommended* that as a first step in international standardization of geographical names, each country should have a national geographical names authority:

(a)   consisting of a continuing body, or co-ordinated group of bodies, having clearly stated authority and instructions for the standardization of geographical names and the determination of names standardization policy within the country;

98

(b) having such status, composition, function and procedures as will
   (i) be consistent with the governmental structure of the country;
   (ii) give the greatest chance of success in the national name standardization programme;
   (iii) as appropriate, provide within its framework for the establishment of regional or local committees according to area or language;
   (iv) provide for consideration of the effects of its actions on government agencies, private organizations and other groups with the long range interests of the country as a whole;
   (v) make full use of the services of surveyors, cartographers, geographers, linguists and any other experts who may help the authority to carry out its operations efficiently;
   (vi) permit record keeping and publication procedures that will facilitate the prompt and wide distribution of information on its standardized names, both nationally and internationally.

It is *recommended* that those countries which have not yet begun to exercise their prerogative of standardizing their geographical names on a national basis, now proceed to do so.

It is *further recommended* that the appropriate United Nations Office be kept informed by each national names authority of its composition and functions, and of the address of its Secretary.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4 (b)

Collection of Geographical Names

For each geographical name which is to be standardized, it is *recommended* that:

(a) there be as complete a field and office research as pertinent to provide information on the following points:
   (i) written and spoken form of the name and its meaning according to local inhabitants;
   (ii) spelling in cadastral documents and land registers;
   (iii) spelling on modern and old maps and in other historical sources;
   (iv) spelling in census reports, gazetteers and other relevant documents of value;
   (v) spelling used by other local administrative and technical services;
(b) the local spoken form of the name be recorded on tape and written in the phonetic notation approved by the national names authority;
(c) the character, extent and position of the feature named be determined and recorded as accurately as possible and that the meaning of the generic terms locally used be clearly defined. (In this regard it should be noted that air photographs can provide useful supplementary information.)

(d) If possible, at least two local independent sources be consulted
     for each enquiry.

It is *further recommended* that personnel responsible for the collection
of names should have training adequate to recognize and deal with the linguis-
tic problems (phonetic system, grammatical structure and orthography),
geographic phenomena and terminology that they are likely to encounter.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4 (c)

Office Treatment of Geographical Names

It is *recommended* that each names authority formulate, adopt and de-
fine the guiding principles and practices that it will normally apply in
the course of operation.

These principles and practices should cover:

(a) Formal procedures to be followed in the submission to the authority
     of proposals for new names or changes in names.
(b) Factors that the authority will take into account when considering
     name proposals, e.g.
     (1) current usage;
     (2) historical background;
     (3) treatment in multilingual areas and in unwritten languages;
     (4) the extent to which hybrid names should be avoided;
     (5) avoidance of repetition of names;
     (6) avoidance of more than one name for one feature;
     (7) clarification of precise extent of application of each
          individual geographical name including clarification in
          naming of the whole and the parts of major features;
     (8) elimination of objectionable names.
(c) Rules of writing names applied by the authority.
(d) Procedures whereby all interested parties may express their views
     on a name proposal prior to decision by the authority.
(e) Formal procedures for promulgation of the authority's decisions
     and for ensuring that standardized names shall appear on the
     national maps.

In the elaboration of these principles it is *recommended* that:

1.   unnecessary changing of names be avoided;
2.   the spelling of geographical names be as much as possible in accordance
     with the current orthographic practice of the country concerned, with
     due regard to dialect forms;
3.   systematic treatment of names should not operate to suppress significant
     elements;
4.   where some names occur in varying or grammatical forms, the national
     names authority should consider making one of these forms the standard
     name (for nouns that can be declined, it will normally be the nominative
     case);

5. in all countries in whose languages the definite article can enter into geographical names, the national names authority should determine which names contain the definite article and standardize them accordingly. For languages in which both definite and indefinite forms exist for all or most names, it is recommended that standardization be based on one or the other form;

6. all countries set up standards for the use of abbreviations of elements in their geographical names;

7. a system be devised in each country for the treatment of compound names.

It is *further recommended* that the names authority give adequate publicity to these principles and practices.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4(d)

Multilingual Areas

It is *recommended* that, in countries in which there exist more than one language, the national authority as appropriate;

(a) determine the geographical names in each of the official languages, and other languages as appropriate;

(b) give a clear indication of equality or precedence of officially acknowledged names;

(c) publish these officially acknowledged names in maps and gazetteers.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4 (e)

National Gazetteers

It is *recommended* that each names authority produce, and continually revise, appropriate gazetteers of all its standardized geographical names.

It is *further recommended* that each gazetteer, in addition to the standardized names, include as a minimum, such information as is necessary for the proper location and identification of the named features.

In particular, it is *recommended* that the following be included:

(a) The kind of feature to which the name applies;

(b) Precise description of the location and the extent, including a point position reference if possible, of each named feature;

(c) Provision for the parts of natural features to be additionally defined by reference to the whole and for the names of extended features to be defined as necessary by reference to their constituent parts;

(d) Such information on administrative or regional areas as is considered necessary and, if possible, reference to a map or chart within which the features lie;

(e) If there is more than one officially standardized name for a
     feature, then all should be given, and also provision be made to
     cross-reference names previously used for the same feature.

When national authorities determine it possible, both technically and
economically, they may include such information on geographical names as
gender, number, definite and indefinite forms, position of stress, tone and
pronunciation in the system of the International Phonetic Association and
such other linguistic information as may lead to the better understanding
and use of names both nationally and internationally.

RESOLUTION NO. 5

EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION AND BIBLIOGRAPHIES

The Conference,

Recognizing the enormous volume of geographical names to cover the world
and the great diversity of geographic nomenclature programmes from country
to country,

Considering the advantages to the Member States of the United Nations
and Members of its specialized agencies to exchange information relative
both to strengthening their own names programmes and furthering inter-
national standardization of geographical names,

Recommends that the United Nations continues to serve as a documentation
centre where information can be collected and disseminated, bibliographies be
prepared and distributed, and arrangements be made for direct exchanges
among Member States.

RESOLUTION NO. 6

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The Conference,

Noting the important role which United Nations technical assistance has
had and continues to have in cartography,

Recognizing the contribution which the United Nations has made and is
making in this field,

Recommends that in all cases where technical assistance experts in
surveying and mapping are at work due attention should be given to the
standardization of geographical names,

Further recommends that individual countries or groups of countries within the same region or having common interests be encouraged to request, when necessary, technical assistance in the form of training for their personnel, consultants and/or technical material and information, which they consider important in fulfilling their work programmes on the standardization of geographical names.

RESOLUTION NO. 7

REGIONAL MEETINGS

The Conference,

Recognizing the success of regional cartographic conferences held at the initiative of the United Nations and the bearing which these conferences have had on the convening of the present international Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names,

Recommends

(a) that regional and sub-regional conferences should be held at appropriate intervals to discuss common problems connected with, and to further the standardization of, geographical names;

(b) that groups of nations having certain common interests and problems should be encouraged to meet at their own initiative and to report on progress made to the appropriate sub-regional or regional conferences and to the United Nations.

RESOLUTION NO. 8

TREATMENT OF NAMES OF FEATURES BEYOND A SINGLE SOVEREIGNTY

(A) *General*

The Conference,

Recognizing that some features common to, or extending across the frontiers of, two or more nations have more than one name applied to them,

Further recognizing that the names of some features of this kind have different applications or extent,

Considers that it is preferable that a common name or a common application be established, wherever practicable, in the interest of international standardization,

Recommends that the geographical names authorities of the nations concerned attempt to reach agreement on these conflicting names or applications.

(B) *Maritime and Undersea Features*

The Conference,

Having discussed some of the problems arising from a lack of international standardization of names of maritime and undersea features,

Recognizing the necessity for international standardization of names in and under ocean areas to promote the safety of navigation and to facilitate the exchange of scientific oceanographic data,

Noting that valuable initial steps have been taken toward standardization of both the nomenclature of hydrographic and undersea features and the geographical names of some of these features by the Inter-governmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC), the International Hydrographic Bureau (IHB), the International Association of Physical Oceanography (IAPO), and member nations,

Recommends that the proposed United Nations Permanent Commission on Geographical Names should:

(a) obtain from the IOC, the IHB and the IAPO full particulars of the work already accomplished by those organizations;
(b) establish means for United Nations collection, approval and distribution of both a list of agreed terms and definitions for nomenclature of maritime and undersea features, and an initial list of recommended geographical names for features requiring names;
(c) develop procedures for international standardization of naming new undersea features as they are discovered, defined, and identified in the future, and
(d) continue to consult with and, as appropriate, to use the facilities of the IOC, the IHB, the IAPO and other relevant bodies to further United Nations objectives in international standardization of names of maritime and undersea features;

Further recommends that copies of this resolution be forwarded immediately to the IOC, IHB and IAPO.

RESOLUTION NO. 9

TRANSCRIPTION OF NAMES FROM THAI CHARACTERS INTO ROMAN

The Conference,

Recognizes the modified general system currently being officially employed in the transcription of geographical names from Thai characters

into roman, and

Notes the application of such system for the official bilingual map of Thailand,

Further notes that there is no competing system for the romanization of Thai,

Recommends the adoption of the modified general system of the Royal Institute (which is set out in E/Conf.53/L.20) as the international system for romanization of Thai geographical names.

RESOLUTION NO. 10

ARABIC ALPHABET GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES

The Conference,

Recognizing that modern practice has come to require the rendition of Arabic alphabet geographical names in terms of standard, that is, classical forms,

Recommends that Arabic-speaking countries provide as soon as possible complete documentation for all geographical names, including the provision of all vowels and the notation of unvowelled and double consonants by means of the Arabic diacritical marks such as vowel points, shaddahs, hamzahs and sukuns.

RESOLUTION NO. 11

ROMANIZATION OF ARABIC NAMES

The Conference,

Noting the romanization system currently being employed in the trans-literation of names for the official romanized maps of Libya, Saudi Arabia, etc., and

Noting also the different romanization system being used in the current mapping of the Lebanon, Syria, etc., and

Recognizing the variety of systems being used in other Arabic-speaking countries,

Recommends that those Arabic countries who intend producing romanized maps or gazetteers for official use investigate the possibility of agreeing on a single system for the romanization of Arabic geographical names for

official use in all Arabic-speaking countries. *Alternatively,* if a single
romanization system proves to be impracticable it is recommended that the
use of two systems only, one based on the French system of transliteration
and the second on the English, be considered.

RESOLUTION NO. 12

TRANSLITERATION OF FARSI GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES TO ROMAN

The Conference,

Notes that Iran has officially adopted and used for many years a system
for romanizing Iranian geographical names from Persian script,

Further notes that this system is in consonance with scientific lin-
guistic principles relating to transference between writing systems,

Recommends the adoption of the system set forth by the Government of
Iran in the publication entitled in its English version *Transliteration of
Farsi Geographic Names to Latin Alphabet,* September 1966, as the inter-
national system for the romanization from Persian script of geographical
names of Iran.

RESOLUTION NO. 13

ACCENTS AND DIACRITICAL SIGNS

The Conference,

Recognizes that the accents and diacritical signs which accompany the
Latin alphabet letters of many languages are an integral part of the spelling
of these languages, in which they express such essential features as the
tonic accent, the length and degree of openness of vowels, and other signi-
ficant aspects of pronunciation and meaning;

Recommends that in international use all geographical names officially
written in these alphabets by the countries concerned should remain un-
modified and keep their distinguishing marks, even and indeed particularly
when they are written in capitals.

RESOLUTION NO. 14

TRANSLITERATION OF AMHARIC TO ROMAN

The Conference,

Recognizing the need to adopt a single system for the transliteration of Amharic into the Roman alphabet,

Recommends that the Amharic to English transliteration system to be adopted by the Ethiopian national geographical names authority be considered by the United Nations Permanent Committee of Experts for acceptance as the standard international system for the writing of Ethiopian geographical names in the Roman alphabet.

RESOLUTION NO. 15

LACK OF WRITING SYSTEMS

The Conference,

Recognizing the many problems resulting from the lack of a writing system for many languages of the world, and

Further recognizing the need to record such languages as scientifically as possible in a suitable writing system,

Recommends that for the purpose of recording geographical names of unwritten languages the methods to be employed, in order of preference, will be:

(a)   recording in a phonemic writing system
(b)   recording in the alphabet of the International Phonetic Association (IPA);
   (i)   Where necessary, a narrow transcription of the pronunciation of the geographical name will be carried out in order to record as precisely as possible the full phonetic character of each name;
   (ii)   In normal circumstances, the broad transcription of a name in the alphabet of the International Phonetic Association will be carried out;
   (iii) The final writing of the geographical name will be in an appropriate conventional alphabet or script, to approximate as nearly as possible the sound represented by the IPA broad transcription;
(c)   recording in the alphabet of a kindred language for which an alphabet exists, and
(d)   recording directly into a conventional alphabet or other writing system:
   (i)   by a person familiar with the language from which the recording is made; or, in the absence of such a person,
   (ii)   by a person with no knowledge of the language concerned. When the person making the recording is unfamiliar with the language, as much information as possible will be recorded in order to assess the reliability of the name as finally written.

RESOLUTION NO. 16

ROMANIZATION OF CHINESE CHARACTERS

The Conference,

Recognizing the extremely complex nature of the problems connected with the Romanization of Chinese characters, and

Further recognizing the need to adopt a single system for the Romanization of Chinese geographical names,

Recommends that the attention of the proposed United Nations Permanent Commission of Experts on Geographical Names be drawn to the Romanization system at present used by the Government of the Republic of China for the Romanization of its official maps, books and other documents dealing with geographical names and described in E/Conf.53/L.46 in relation to other romanization systems,

Further recommends the United Nations Permanent Commission of Experts on Geographical Names to consider the suitability of this system for acceptance as the standard system for the Romanization of Chinese geographical names.

RESOLUTION NO. 17

CONFUSION ARISING FROM DIFFERENT ROMANIZATION SYSTEMS

The Conference,

Considering the duplication and confusion arising from the existence of different romanization systems based on the phonetic structure of the receiver languages,

Recommends that efforts should be made to arrive at an agreement on one single romanization based on scientific principles from each non-roman alphabet or script, for international application,

Further recommends that a special group of experts under the responsibility of the United Nations Permanent Commission on Geographical Names, should concentrate on this subject to make a comparative study of the various romanization systems and to analyze their advantages and disadvantages as media for standardization of geographical names,

Further recommends that this special group of experts should consider the views expressed by the various international (ICA, ICAO, ICOS, IHB, ISO, ITU, UPU etc.) and national bodies (BGN, PCGN, USSR Academy etc.) and seek ways to accomplish the adoption of one single romanization from each non-roman alphabet or script for international application as soon as may be possible.

RESOLUTION NO. 18

RENDITION OF AFRICAN LANGUAGES INTO ROMANIZED SCRIPT

The Conference,

Recognizing the existence of a large number of languages in Africa whose rendition into Romanized script presents very complex problems in the transcription of geographical names, and

Noting that the French and English alphabets are mostly employed in the rendering of geographical names in these syllabic languages,

Draws the attention of the U.N. Permanent Commission of Experts on Geographical Names to the peculiar nature of these problems, and

Requests the Commission to give special attention to these problems with a view to achieving an accurate rendering of sounds within the French and English language areas.

RESOLUTION NO. 19

GEOGRAPHICAL TERMS

The Conference,

Recognizing the importance of geographical terms as used in a given region,

Urges that the recommendations that follow should be given complete and due consideration by national names authorities.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 19 (a)

Study of Nature of Geographical Entities

The Conference,

Recommends that a study be made of the nature of geographical entities which in a given region have names, as well as of the various meanings of words used to designate said features.

These studies might bring to light noteworthy facts which would allow a better understanding of the geographical entities named. They may also serve to bring out the deficiencies of ordinary dictionaries in this respect.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 19 (b)

Glossary In Gazetteers

The Conference,

Recommends that national gazetteers should include a glossary, not necessarily published in the same volume.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 19 (c)

Definition of Generic Term

The Conference,

Recommends the approval of the following definition:

> <u>*Generic term:*</u> *Term included in a geographical name, indicating the type of the named entity and having the same meaning in current local use.*

RECOMMENDATION NO. 19 (d)

Definition of Glossary

The Conference,

Recommends the approval of the following definition:

> <u>*Glossary:*</u> *Collection of generic terms with their meanings in geographical names.*

A P P E N D I C E S

I   - List of documents issued for the Conference

II - List of delegates and observers

III - Guiding Principles of the Canadian Permanent
            Committee on Geographical Names
      Principes directeurs du Comité permanent canadien
            des noms géographiques

APPENDIX I

LIST OF DOCUMENTS ISSUED

FOR THE CONFERENCE

No.	Title	Prepared by
E/Conf.53/1	Provisional Agenda	U.N. Secretariat
E/Conf.53/INF/1	Information regarding general arrangements of interest to the participants	U.N. Secretariat
E/Conf.53/INF/1/Add.1	Information to participants	U.N. Secretariat
E/Conf.53/INF/2	List of Documents Issued for the Conference	U.N. Secretariat
E/Conf.53/INF/2/Add.1	Revised List of Documents issued for the Conference	U.N. Secretariat
E/Conf.53/L.1	Report of the Group of Experts	U.N. Secretariat
E/Conf.53/L.1/Add.1	Some Problems in Cartographic Toponomy (Background paper)	U.N. Secretariat
E/Conf.53/L.1/Add.2	Preparations for the forth-coming Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names (Background Paper)	U.N. Secretariat
E/Conf.53/L.2	Extracts from World Cartography, Volume VII	U.N. Secretariat
E/Conf.53/L.3	Reports by Governments on the Progress made in the Standardization of Geographical Names	Kenya

No.	Title	Prepared by
E/Conf.53/L.4	Exchange of experience on problems identified in the Group of Expert's Report	Kenya
E/Conf.53/L.5	National Standardization Administrative structure of national names authorities	Kenya
E/Conf.53/L.6	Reports by governments on the progress made in the standardization of geographical names	Netherlands
E/Conf.53/L.7	National standardization - national gazetteers	New Zealand
E/Conf.53/L.8	Exchange of experience on problems identified in the Group of Experts' Report	Canada
E/Conf.53/L.9	Reports by Governments on the progress made in the standardization of geographical names	Federal Republic of Germany
E/Conf.53/L.10	Writing systems - proposal on the transliteration and transcription of geographical names	Federal Republic of Germany
E/Conf.53/L.11	Exchange of Experience on problems identified in the report of the Group of Experts	Federal Republic of Germany
E/Conf.53/L.12	Reports by Governments on the Progress made in the Standardization of geographical names	Austria
E/Conf.53/L.13	Reports by governments on the progress made in the standardization of geographical names	Hungary
E/Conf.53/L.14	Writing systems	Hungary
E/Conf.53/L.15	International cooperation - Formation of a United Nations permanent commission of Experts on geographical names, bibliography	Hungary

No.	Title	Prepared by
E/Conf.53/L.16	National standardization codification of geographic names for United States Government needs	United States of America
E/Conf.53/L.17	Reports by Governments on the progress made in the standardization of geographical names	Thailand
E/Conf.53/L.18	National standardization identification code numbers for administrative division in Thailand	Thailand
E/Conf.53/L.19	National standardization - national gazetteers	Thailand
E/Conf.53/L.20	Writing systems - transfer of names from Thai writing system to Roman letters	Thailand
E/Conf.53/L.21	Reports by Governments on progress made in the standardization of geographical names	Nigeria
E/Conf.53/L.22	Report on the standardization of geographical names in Cameroon	Cameroon
E/Conf.53/L.23	Report by Governments made on the standardization of geographical names	Australia
E/Conf.53/L.24	National Standardization and writing systems	Cyprus
E/Conf.53/L.25	Reports by Governments on the Progress made in the standardization of geographical names	Israel
E/Conf.53/L.26	International Cooperation - steps towards international standardization	United States of America
E/Conf.53/L.27	Writing systems - transfer of names from one writing system to another into roman	United States of America

No.	Title	Prepared by
E/Conf.53/L.28	Geographical terms - glossaries	United States of America
E/Conf.53/L.29	Writing Systems - transfer of names from one writing system to another into Roman	United States of America
E/Conf.53/L.30	Reports by governments on the progress made in the standardization of geographical names	United States of America
E/Conf.53/L.31	Writing Systems - some general principles of transliteration and transcription	United States of America
E/Conf.53/L.32	Writing Systems - Collection and treatment of Geographic Names in Libya	United States of America
E/Conf.53/L.33	National Standardization - Guidelines for preparing and submitting proposals regarding domestic geographical names	United States of America
E/Conf.53/L.34	Writing Systems - Transfer of names from one writing system to another - Romanization Guide 1967	United States of America
E/Conf.53/L.35	Reports by Governments on the Progress made in the standardization of geographical names	Spain
E/Conf.53/L.35/Add.1	Reports by Governments on the progress made in the standardization of geographical names	Spain
E/Conf.53/L.36	Principes de Translitteration de l'Arabe en caractères latins	France
E/Conf.53/L.37	Writing systems - Some problems in transferring geographic names from one writing system to another	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

No.	Title	Prepared by
E/Conf.53/L.38	Interrelated problems between national and international geographic names standardization	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
E/Conf.53/L.39	International dictionary for local geographic terms	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
E/Conf.53/L.40	Work done on the standard-ization of geographical names in the U.S.S.R.	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
E/Conf.53/L.41	Problems of geographic names standardization experienced in a multinational country	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
E/Conf.53/L.42	Reports by Governments on the progress made in the standardization of geographical names	Republic of the Congo
E/Conf.53/L.43	Geographical Terms	ICAO
E/Conf.53/L.44	Guatemala. Some of its Toponymic Problems	Guatemala
E/Conf.53/L.45	Report by Venezuela on Geographical Names	Venezuela
E/Conf.53/L.46	Reports by Governments on the Progress Made in the Standard-ization of Geographical Names	Republic of China
E/Conf.53/L.47	Echange de Donnés d'Expérience concernant les problèmes énoncés dans le rapport du groupe d'experts	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
E/Conf.53/L.48	Some problems of the rendering of geographical names from one system of writing into another	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
E/Conf.53/L.49	Problems of Standardization of Geographical Names under the conditions of a multinational State (Issued in French under E/Conf.53/L.41)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
E/Conf.53/L.50	An international Glossary of Local Geographic Terms	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

No.	Title	Prepared by
E/Conf.53/L.51	Problems of Correlation of National and International Standardization of Geographical Names (Issued in French under symbol E/Conf.53/L.38)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
E/Conf.53/L.52	Principes de Transcription des Toponymes Africains	France
E/Conf.53/L.53	Field Geographic Names Reports - Supplemental Instructions	United States of America
E/Conf.53/L.54	Statement from the International Hydrographic Bureau	I.H.B.
E/Conf.53/L.55	Decision relating to Multilingual Areas (Ref. Recommendation VII of the Experts' Report E/3441)	United States of America
E/Conf.53/L.56	Administrative Structure of National Name Authorities	Canada
E/Conf.53/L.57	The Roman Alphabet Rule	United Kingdom
E/Conf.53/L.58	Names on Ordnance Survey Maps and Plans	United Kingdom
E/Conf.53/L.59	Progress made in the Standardization of Geographical Names	Canada
E/Conf.53/L.60	Normalisation Nationale et Répertoires Géographiques	France
E/Conf.53/L.61	Termes Techniques	France
E/Conf.53/L.62	Normalisation Nationale	France
E/Conf.53/L.63	Principles and Procedures	Canada
E/Conf.53/L.64	Gazetteer of Canada	Canada
E/Conf.53/L.65	Report by Governments on the Progress made in the Standardization of Geographical Names - Situation in Dutch-speaking Belgium	Belgium
E/Conf.53/L.66	Collection and Treatment of Geographical Names in Sweden	Sweden
E/Conf.53/L.67	Scandinavian Regional Standardization	Denmark, Sweden and Norway

No.	Title	Prepared by
E/Conf.53/L.68	Report on the Standardization of Geographical Names	Romania
E/Conf.53/L.69	La Toponymie à Madagascar	Madagascar
E/Conf.53/L.70	Reports by Governments of the Progress made in the standardization of Geographical Names	Finland
E/Conf.53/L.71	Reports by Governments on the progress made in the standardization of geographical names	United Kingdom
E/Conf.53/L.72	Automation of Undersea feature names	United States of America
E/Conf.53/L.73	Writing System. Transliteration	International Organization for Standardization
E/Conf.53/L.74	Reports by Governments on the progress made in the standardization of geographical names	Ghana
E/Conf.53/L.75	Excerpts from the specification of the international map of the world on the millionth scale (Vol. 2)	U.N. Secretariat
E/Conf.53/L.76	Code pour les désignations abrégées des principaux détails topographiques apparaissant couramment sur les cartes officielles libanaises	Lebanon
E/Conf.53/L.77	Expérience sur le traitement des noms dans les régions multilingues ou de minorités de langues	Switzerland
E/Conf.53/L.78	Note bibliographique sur les glossaires publiés	Switzerland
E/Conf.53/L.79	Condition and prospects of the work on orthography	People's Republic of Bulgaria
E/Conf.53/L.80	Notes on the preparation of a Guatemalan geographical dictionary	Guatemala

No.	Title	Prepared by
E/Conf.53/L.81	Letter and paper on Standardization of Geographical Names	Hungary
E/Conf.53/L.82	Noms Géographiques en Ecriture Cyrillique. Note de M. H.J. van de Wijer, Secrétaire Général du ICOS	ICOS
E/Conf.53/L.83	ICOS et la standardisation internationale des noms géographiques	ICOS
E/Conf.53/L.84	Paper submitted by the Govt. of Norway	Norway
E/Conf.53/L.85	Letter from Delegations of France Fed. Rep. of Germany, UK, USA	
E/Conf.53/L.86	Reports on the progress made in the standardization of geographical names	Cambodia
E/Conf.53/L.87	Letter dated 22 September 1967 addressed to the Chairman of the Conference	(Bulgaria (Poland (Hungary (USSR
E/Conf.53/L.88	Reports on the progress made in the standardization of geographical names	Poland
E/Conf.53/L.89	Reports on the progress made in the standardization of geographical names	Switzerland
E/Conf.53/2	Draft Report of the Conference (Chapter I)	
E/Conf.53/2/Add.1	Draft Report of the Conference Chapter II - Resolutions and Recommendations (in part)	
E/Conf.53/2/Add.2	Draft Report of the Conference Chapter II - Resolutions and Recommendations (in part)	
E/Conf.53/2/Add.3	Draft Report of the Conference Chapter II - Resolutions and Recommendations (in part) Committee III	

No.	Title
E/Conf.53/2/Add.4	Draft Report of the Conference Chapter II - Resolutions and Recommendations (in part) Committee II
E/Conf.53/2/Add.5	Resolution 2 of the Second UN Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names
E/Conf.53/C.1/1	Draft Report of Committee I
E/Conf.53/C.2/1	Draft Report of Committee II
E/Conf.53/C.3/1	Draft Report of Committee III
E/Conf.53/C.4/1	Draft Report of Committee IV

APPENDIX II

LIST OF DELEGATES AND OBSERVERS

A - Governments

ARGENTINA   Sr. Osvaldo G. GARCIA PINEIRO
                             Consejero de Embajada

AUSTRALIA   Mr. B.P. LAMBERT
                             Director of National Mapping
                             Department of National Development

AUSTRIA   Prof. Dr. Josef BREU
                             Head of Geographical Department of
                             Austria

BELGIUM   M. H.J. VAN DE WIJER
                             Membre de la Commission Royale de
                             Toponymie et Dialectologie

                             M. J.H. HERBILLON
                             Professeur

BULGARIA   M. Benjamin COHEN
                             Président du Conseil bulgare pour
                             l'orthographe et la transcription de
                             noms géographiques de la République
                             Populaire de Bulgarie.

CAMBODIA   M. le Commandant TEAO Sunthan
                             Directeur du Service Géographique National

                             M. le Capitaine EK Siphen
                             Chef du Bureau d'Astronomie et Geodésie

CAMEROON	M. B.P.M. MARTY Directeur du Centre de l'Institut Géographique National à Yaoundé
CANADA	M. Jean-Paul DROLET Président, Comité permanent canadian des noms géographiques, Ottawa
	Dr. J.K. FRASER Executive Secretary, Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names
	M. Jean POIRIER Secrétaire, la Commission de Géographie du Québec
	Mr. Eric J. HOLMGREN Secretary, Geographic Board of Alberta
	M. Richard McKINNON Premier Secrétaire, Mission Permanente du Canada, Genève
CHAD	M. POMMERAUD Directeur de l'Annexe de l'Institut Géographique National à Brazzaville
CHILE	Sr. German CARRASCO Consejero, Delegacion Permanente de Chile, Ginebra
CHINA	Prof. SUN Tang-yueh Director Institute of Geography College of Chinese Culture
	Mr. Peter B.T. CHANG Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Republic of China to the United Nations Geneva
	Mr. CHANG Wei-i Deputy Director Department of Land Administration Ministry of Interior
	Lt. Col. CHANG Chih-sheng Survey Engineer Officer Topographical Service

CYPRUS	Mr. Menelaos N. CHRISTODOULOU Cyprus Scientific Research Centre
	M. R.G. CHAILLON Bureau du Consul Général de Chipre à Genève
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	Dr. Ondrej ROUBIK Secretary of the Terminological Committee
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO	M. Augustin KENGEBELE Directeur de l'Institut Géographique du Congo, Kinshasa
DENMARK	Mr. Einar A. ANDERSEN Director, Royal Danish Geodetic Institute Professor of Geodesy, University of Copenhagen Member of the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	Dr. Manuel Bernardo DIAZ FRANJUL Consejero, Delegacion Permanente de la Republica Dominicana, Ginebra
ECUADOR	Dr. José R. MARTINEZ COBO Embajador, Mision Permanente, Ginebra
ETHIOPIA	Mr. Demissew ASSAYE Imperial Ethiopian Mapping and Geography Institute
	Mr. Hailu EMMANUEL Mapping and Geography Institute
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY	Prof. Dr. Emil MEYNEN Director of the 'Institut fur Landeskunde in der Bundesanstalt fur Landeskunde und Raunforschung', Bad Godesberg
	Dr. A. GRUESSNER Head of Geographic Service Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Mr. F. HOFFMANN Regierungsdirektor Institut fur Landeskunde in der Bundesanstalt fur Landeskunde und Raumforschung, Bad Godesberg
	Dr. W. EGGERS Oberstudienrat
	Mrs. H. VOMSTEIN
	Mr. K. HORNBERG

FINLAND	Mr. Veikko NURMI Chief Engineer at the General Survey Office of Finland
	M. Viljo NISSILA Directeur de l'Archive de Noms
	Mr. Kerkko HAKULINEN Assistant of Geography University of Helsinki
FRANCE	Mr. François NEDELEC Ingénieur-en-Chef Géographe
	M. André PEGORIER Ingénieur-en-Chef Géographe
GHANA	Prof. E.A. BOATENG Professor of Geography University of Ghana
	Mr. R.J. SIMPSON Chief Survey Officer, Survey Division
GUATEMALA	Prof. Francis GALL Jefe, Departamento de Geografia Humana Instituto Geografico Nacional, y Presidente de la Sociedad de Geografia e Historia de Guatemala
HOLY SEE	M. le Chanoine Gaston POLSPOEL Doyen de la Faculté des Sciences de l'Université de Louvain
	M. le Professeur Gastone IMBRIGHI Professeur de Géographie à l'Université de l'Aquila
HUNGARY	Mr. FOLDI Ervin Secretary, Committee on Geographical Names
IRAN	M. le Général de Division Mahmoud SADEGHIAN Chef du Service Géographique de l'Armée Iranienn
	Dr. Yahya Mayar NAWABI Professeur de Philologie Université de Téhéran
	Dr. Kazem VADIIE Professeur de Géographie Université de Téhéran
	Mr. Ahmad MOSTOFI Directeur de l'Institut et du département de Géographie de l'Université de Téhéran

ISRAEL	Mr. Mordecai KIDRON Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Permanent Representative of Israel at Geneva Mr. Joel ALON Second Secretary Permanent Mission of Israel to the United Nations, Geneva
KENYA	Mr. John LOXTON Assistant Director of Survey Secretary to the Standing Committee on Geographical Names
LEBANON	M. Mohamed Z. AYOUBI Commandant Inspecteur des Travaux Géographiques Président de la Commission de la Toponymie M. Albert MATTA Chef du Service de Documentation à la Direction des Affaires Géographiques
LIBERIA	The Hon. A. Momolu MASSAQUOI Director of Natural Resources and Surveys, Monrovia Dr. A.E. Nyema JONES Chief of Geological Survey Bureau of Natural Resources and Surveys
LIBYA	Mr. Mukhtar Mustafa BURU Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Arts, University of Libya, Benghazi
LUXEMBOURG	M. Albert J.P. GALLES Sous-Directeur de l'Administration du Cadastre et de la Topographie
MADAGASCAR	M. Solonavalona ANDRIAMIHAJA Ingénieur Principal Géographe Directeur Adjoint du Centre de l'Institut Géographique National M. Edmond ANDRIANARIVO Ingénieur Géographe Chef de la Section Cartographique du Centre de l'Institut Géographique National
MEXICO	Dr. Guido GOMEZ DE SILVA Presidente, Comision Mexicana de Nombres Geograficos

NETHERLANDS	Prof. Dr. Ferdinand J. ORMELING Professor of Economic Geography University of Amsterdam Secretary/Treasurer, International Cartographic Association
	Mr. Henri Nellius DAHLBERG Principal, Surinam Teacher Training College in Paramaribo
	Dr. Dirk Peter BLOK Director of the Central Committee for Research into the Character of Dutch Culture
NORWAY	Mr. Kristian GLEDITSCH Director of the Geographical Service of Norway
	Prof. Eyvind Fjeld HALVORSEN University of Oslo
	Prof. Per HOVDA Chief of Place-Name Archives University of Oslo
PAKISTAN	Dr. Maqbool A. BHATTY Permanent Mission of Pakistan to the United Nations, Geneva
PERU	Sr. Felipe SOLARI SWAYNE Delegacion Permanente del Peru, Ginebra
POLAND	Prof. Lech RATAJSKI Head of the Cartography Division of Warsaw University and Chairman of the Commission on Standardization of Geographical Names at the Geographical Institute of the Polish Academy of Sciences
PORTUGAL	Dr. Julio Manuel MARTINS Directeur Général de l'Instituto Geografico e Cadastral
	M. José FARINHA DA CONCEICAO Directeur du Centro de Geografia do Ultramar
ROMANIA	Mr. Alexandru ROSU National Geographical Committee
	Mr. Costel MITRAN Second Secretary Permanent Mission of Romania to the United Nations, Geneva
	M. Victor SFICLEA Maître de Conférence à l'Université de Tassy

126

SENEGAL	M. Moustapha SARR
	Directeur de l'aménagement du Territoire
SPAIN	Mr. Angel PEREZ GALINO
	Secretario del Consejo Superior Geografico
	Mr. José CORDERAS DESCARREGA
	Secretario de la Comision de Toponimia
SWEDEN	Mr. Sven-Eric LINDQVIST
	National Geographical Survey Office
SWITZERLAND	Prof. Ernst SPIESS
	Directeur de l'Institut Cartographique de l'Ecole Politechnique Fédérale
	M. Armin BLEUER
	Vice-Directeur du Service Topographique Suisse
	Mr. Ernest SCHULE
	Rédacteur du 'Glossaire des Patois de la Suisse Romande'
THAILAND	Col. Banlang KHAMASUNDARA
	Chief, Geographic Mapping Division
	Royal Thai Survey Department
	Lt. Col. Bunsoem THIPPHAYATHAT
	Chief, Geographical Names Section
	Geographic Mapping Division
	Royal Thai Survey Department
	Mr. Pilandh MALAKUL
	Deputy Director-General
	Royal Irrigation Department
TURKEY	Mr. Ozdemir BENLER
	Ambassador
	Permanent Mission of Turkey to the United Nations, Geneva
	Mr. Metin SIRMAN
	Permanent Mission of Turkey to the United Nations, Geneva
	Mr. Hasan EREN
	Professor, University of Ankara

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS	Mr. A.N. BARANOV Deputy Chief Administration of Geodesy and Cartography
	Mr. A.M. KOMKOV Professor, Moscow State University
	Mr. V.I. KOULIKOV First Secretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Mr. G.F. Kuzmin Engineer, Hydrographical Service of the Navy
	Mrs. I.P. LITVIN Scientific Worker Central Scientific Institute of Geodesy Air Surveying and Cartography
	Mr. E.M. MURZAEV Professor of Geography Geographical Institute USSR Academy of Science
UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC	Mr. Omar Ali AMER Third Secretary, U.A.R. Delegation, Geneva
UNITED KINGDOM	Mr. H.A.G. LEWIS Ministry of Defence
	Mr. P.S. FALLA Foreign Office
	Mr. P.J.M. GEELAN Secretary, Permanent Committee on Geo- graphical Names for British official use
	Mr. K.R. SHICKLE Ministry of Defence
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	Dr. Meredith F. BURRILL Director, Office of Geography Department of the Interior
	Dr. G. Etzel PEARCY The Geographer Department of State
	Mr. Loren A. BLOOM Technical Manager Product Requirements Office Directorate for Mapping, Charting and Geodesy, Department of Defence

	Mr. John G. MUTZIGER
	Office of Geography
	Department of the Interior

Mr. Charles D. ROUSE
Naval Oceanographic Office
Department of the Navy

URUGUAY   Dr. Mateo Jorge MAGARINOS DE MELLO
                           Delegacion Permanente del Uruguay, Ginebra

                           Sra. Maria Elena Bidart de LOPEZ
                           Delegacion Permanente del Uruguay, Ginebra

VENEZUELA   Sr. Heriberto APONTE
                           Consejero, Delegacion Permanente de Venezuela,
                           Ginebra

VIETNAM, Republic of   M. PHAN VAN TRINH
                           Troisième Secrétaire de la Mission, Genève

                           M. NGUYEN TU KIEU
                           Attaché de la Mission, Genève

B - United Nations Specialized Agencies

UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION   Mr. Zdenek CAHA
                           Assistant Director General

                           Mr. Sven BACKSTROM
                           Assistant Counsellor
                           Head of the Information and Documentation
                           Department of the Union

INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS UNION

                           Mr. Théodore WETTSTEIN
                           International Frequency Registration Board

                           Mr. Alf. S. WINTER-JENSEN
                           General Secretariat

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

                           Dr. Eero KALKKINEN
                           ECE/FAO Timber Division

C - Inter-governmental Organizations

INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC BUREAU   Capt. Victor Antoine MOITORET
                                      Director

PAN AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

                                   Dr. Meredith F. BURRILL

D - International Scientific Organizations

INTERNATIONAL CARTOGRAPHIC ASSOCIATION

                                   Prof. F.J. ORMELING

INTERNATIONAL GEOGRAPHICAL UNION   Prof. Hans H. BOESCH
                                     Secretary General

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR STANDARDIZATION

                                   Mrs. Johanna EGGERT

                                   Dr. N.N. CHOPRA

                                   Dr. W.H. RABY

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF GEODESY AND GEOPHYSICS

                                   Prof. E. ANDERSEN

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON ANTARCTIC RESEARCH OF THE
INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC UNIONS

                                   Mr. B.P. LAMBERT

E - United Nations Secretariat

Department of Economic and Social Affairs

                         Mr. Vladimir VELEBIT
                         (Executive Secretary of the Economic
                         Commission for Europe)

                         Mr. Roberto ARCE
                         (Representative of the Secretary-General)

Department of Economic and Social Affairs (cont'd)

Mr. Horacio URETA
(Executive Secretary)

Mr. Chris N. CHRISTOPHER
Cartography Section
Resources and Transport Division
(Deputy Executive Secretary)

Office of Conference Service   Dr. M. Bahy El-Din HEFNY

APPENDIX III

GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF NOMENCLATURE
OF THE
CANADIAN PERMANENT COMMITTEE ON GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES

1. NAMES GOVERNED BY STATUTORY AUTHORITY

    The names of *Cities, Towns, Villages, Post Offices, Counties, Townships, Districts, Reserves, Parks,* and other *Legal Divisions* as created by, or as a result of, legislation by the appropriate government *shall be accepted* by the Committee.

2. NAMES GIVEN BY RAILWAY COMPANIES OR RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT COMPANIES

    Railway Companies, major *Utilities* and *Resource Development Companies* should seek the advice of the Committee concerning the use of geographical names connected with their operations.

3. NAMES IN PUBLIC USE

    First consideration should be given to names with well-established public use.

    Unless there are good reasons to the contrary, this principle should prevail when it conflicts with any of the following principles. Local usage should be the prime consideration in settled areas, whereas historical significance should be emphasized in unpopulated areas. Established names which have proved acceptable and satisfactory should not be changed or altered.

4. UNIFORMITY OF NAMES

    Names applying to features in a given locality should be in conformity.

    Examples of undesirable practices are:

    (a) Different names applied to the post office, town or railway station for the same settlement.

(b) Difference in spelling of names of the same origin as applied to related features.

(c) Different names applied to different sections of the same feature, as with a river where the different sections are separated by natural or artificial lakes.

5. DUPLICATION OF NAMES

Duplication of names to the extent that it may cause confusion should be avoided.

In the case of major features this should preclude any duplication within at least a province, whereas for a very minor feature in a settled area the limit need not be beyond the area of a smaller administrative unit such as a township or parish.

6. PERSONAL NAMES

Personal names should not be used unless it is in the public interest to honour a person by applying his name to a geographical feature.

The application of a personal name during the lifetime of the person concerned should only be made in exceptional circumstances. Ownership of land should never in itself be grounds for the application of the owner's or donor's name to a geographical feature included therein.

7. ENGLISH AND FRENCH NAMES

The adoption of both an English and a French form of a name for the same feature should be avoided, except where both forms have the sanction of well-established usage.

This applies generally to major features; minor features should be given names in one language only.

8. INDIAN AND ESKIMO NAMES

(a) *Indian names* for which there are no accepted forms will be recorded according to a recognized local orthography or according to the considered opinion of a recognized linguistic or ethnographic authority.

(b) *Eskimo names* for which there are no accepted forms will be recorded according to a recognized national orthography.

9. FORM AND CHARACTER OF NAMES

Names should be concise, euphonious and in good taste.

Forms that should usually be avoided are:

(a) Unnatural or incongruous combinations of words, including combinations of words of different languages.

(b)   In the case of a personal name, the use of both Christian and surname, or a combination of the two.

(c)   Inclusion of the apostrophe in the English possessive form.

(d)   Qualifying terms such as "Upper", "South", and "West Branch", etc.

(e)   Double naming, e.g. Red (Green) Creek.

(f)   Long and difficult Indian or Eskimo names.

(g)   Corrupted or modified names.

(h)   A name with a connotation of obscenity or blasphemy.

(i)   A name that would appear to be discriminatory or derogatory from the point of view of race, colour or creed.

(j)   A name that could be construed as advertising a particular commercial or industrial enterprise.

10. GENERICS

The generic must be appropriate to the nature of the feature, and its position shall be as dictated by euphony and usage.

The choice of the language used in any given publication is at the discretion of the publisher. However, the generic shall be recorded only in the language having priority of local usage or origin.

11. NAMES OUTSIDE CANADA

For the European area, the form used shall conform to the rules prescribed by NATO Military Agency for Standardization, which include the nomenclature regulations of the International Hydrographic Bureau.

For other countries, usage should be based on that of the national names authority or that of the United Nations.

Conventional names in English or French may be used on very small-scale maps and in textual material at the discretion of the publisher.

12. ORIGIN OF NAMES

No name shall be accepted unless adequate information on its origin or usage is provided to the Committee.

PRINCIPES DIRECTEURS DE NOMENCLATURE
du
COMITE PERMANENT CANADIEN DES NOMS GEOGRAPHIQUES

1. NOMS REGIS PAR L'AUTORITE COMPETENTE

   Le Comité acceptera tous les noms de *cités, villes, villages, bureaux de poste, comtés, cantons, districts, réserves, parcs* et autres *circonscriptions* établis par l'autorité gouvernementale.

2. NOMS DONNES PAR DES SOCIETES DE CHEMINS DE FER ET D'EXPLOITATION DE RICHESSES NATURELLES

   Les sociétés de chemins de fer et *les entreprises de services publics et d'exploitation de richesses naturelles* doivent demander conseil au Comité en ce qui a trait aux noms géographiques qu'elles se proposent d'utiliser dans le cadre de leurs travaux.

3. NOMS RECONNUS PAR L'USAGE

   Il faut, en premier lieu, tenir compte des noms dont l'usage traditionnel est bien établi.

   A moins de bonnes raisons contraires, le principe susmentionné doit prévaloir lorsqu'il est en contradiction avec l'un ou l'autre des principes qui suivent. Dans le cas de régions habitées, l'usage local du nom est de toute première importance alors que dans celui de régions non peuplées, l'aspect historique doit être souligné. Les noms établis qui se sont avérés acceptables et satisfaisants ne devraient pas être changés ou modifiés.

4. UNIFORMITE DES NOMS

   Les noms des entités géographiques d'un même lieu doivent être semblables.

   Il est à déconseiller:

   a) de donner des noms différents à la ville, au bureau de poste ou à la gare d'une même agglomération;

b) d'orthographier différemment les noms de même origine quand ils désignent des entités géographiques connexes; et

c) de désigner par des noms différents les parties d'un accident géographique, notamment une rivière dont le cours est interrompu par des lacs naturels ou artificiels.

5. REPETITION DES NOMS

Il faut éviter le double emploi d'un nom quand celui-ci porte à confusion.

On doit prévenir tout double emploi de noms d'entités géographiques majeures au sein d'une province. Pour ce qui est d'un nom d'une entité géographique de moindre importance, située dans une région habitée, il faut éviter de le répéter à l'intérieur d'une même unité administrative telle un canton ou une paroisse.

6. NOMS DE PERSONNES

Les noms de personnes ne doivent pas être utilisés, à moins qu'il ne soit de l'intérêt public d'honorer une personne en donnant son nom à un accident géographique.

On ne doit pas se servir du nom d'une personne vivante, à moins de circonstances tout à fait particulières. Le nom d'un propriétaire ou d'un donateur de terrain n'est pas en soi justifiable pour en désigner un accident géographique qui se trouve sur ledit terrain.

7. NOMS FRANCAIS ET ANGLAIS

Il ne faut pas accepter les versions française et anglaise d'un nom décrivant une même entité géographique, sauf lorsque les deux noms sont reconnus par l'usage établi.

Ce principe ne s'applique en général qu'aux entités géographiques majeures. Les entités de moindre importance ne doivent être désignées que par un seul nom.

8. NOMS INDIENS ET ESQUIMAUX

a) *Les noms indiens*, pour lesquels il n'existe pas d'orthographe établie, doivent être enregistrés selon l'orthographe locale reconnue ou selon l'avis d'un spécialiste en linguistique ou en ethnographie.

b) *Les noms esquimaux*, pour lesquels il n'existe pas encore d'orthographe établie, doivent être enregistrés selon l'orthographe reconnue au pays.

9. FORMATION ET CARACTERISTIQUES DES NOMS

    Les noms doivent être concis, euphoniques et de bon goût.

    Il faut éviter l'emploi:

    a) de la combinaison de mots affectés ou incongrus, y compris l'union
        de mots de langues différentes;

    b) des noms de personnes composés d'un prénom et d'un nom de famille
        ou l'union des deux en un seul nom;

    c) de l'apostrophe dans le cas du possessif anglais;

    d) de qualificatifs tels que "haut", "supérieur", "sud", "embranchement
        ouest", etc.;

    e) de la désignation double, notamment Ruisseau Rouge (Vert);

    f) des noms indiens ou esquimaux trop longs et compliqués;

    g) des noms modifiés ou altérés;

    h) des noms à sens obscène ou blasphématoire;

    i) des noms paraissant établir des distinctions injustes fondées sur
        la race, la couleur ou la croyance;

    j) des noms pouvant servir de réclame à une entreprise commerciale
        ou industrielle.

10. TERMES GENERIQUES

    *Les termes génériques doivent être appropriés au caractère de l'entité
    géographique qu'ils désignent et conformes à l'euphonie et à l'usage.*

    Les agences de publication peuvent publier des ouvrages dans la langue
    de leur choix. Cependant, le terme générique doit être enregistré
    dans la langue reconnue par l'usage local ou l'origine.

11. NOMS GEOGRAPHIQUES DE PAYS ETRANGERS

    En ce qui concerne les noms géographiques des *pays européens,* on doit se
    soumettre aux règles établies par le Bureau de Standardisation militaire
    de l'OTAN, qui renferment les principes de toponymie adoptés par le
    Bureau international d'hydrographie.

    S'il s'agit *d'autres pays,* on emploie les noms orthographiés suivant les
    directives de l'autorité nationale ou des Nations Unies.

    Une agence de publication peut utiliser les noms conventionnels, en
    anglais ou en français, sur leurs cartes publiées à petite échelle et
    dans leurs ouvrages.

12. ORIGINE DES NOMS

Pour qu'un nom soit accepté, il faut fournir au Comité des renseignements suffisants quant à son origine ou à son usage.

SOUMISSION DE NOMS

Les demandes de renseignements concernant la nomenclature au Canada, les propositions de noms nouveaux, les changements de noms ou les changements d'application de noms actuels doivent être soumis par écrit au *Secrétaire exécutif, Comité permanent canadien des noms géographiques, ministère de l'Energie, des Mines et des Ressources, Ottawa*. Chaque nom doit être accompagné de renseignements suffisants quant à son origine ou à son usage, et doit être identifié sur une carte, un croquis ou une prise de vue aérienne.

SUBMISSION OF NAMES

Inquiries are welcomed concerning nomenclature in Canada, or proposals of new names, name changes or changes in application of existing names. Such proposals should be accompanied by adequate information on origin or usage, the feature identified on a map, sketch or air photographs, and submitted to the *Executive Secretary, Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names, Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, Ottawa*.